# Central BAPTIST THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

KANSAS CITY, KANSAS

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/concerningdateof0000hcho

# CONCERNING THE DATE

OF THE

# BOHAIRIC VERSION

*COVERING A DETAILED EXAMINATION*
*OF THE TEXT OF THE APOCALYPSE*
*AND A REVIEW OF SOME OF*
*THE WRITINGS OF THE*
*EGYPTIAN MONKS*

BY

H. C. HOSKIER

LONDON
BERNARD QUARITCH
1911

LONDON:
PRINTED BY WILLIAM CLOWES AND SONS, LIMITED,
DUKE STREET, STAMFORD STREET, S.E., AND GREAT WINDMILL STREET, W.

225.49
B676
H826

THIS SMALL CONTRIBUTION

TO THE

ELUCIDATION OF AN INTERESTING PROBLEM

IN THE HISTORY OF THE TEXT

IS DEDICATED

TO THOSE OF MY FELLOW-WORKERS

WHO HAVE A JUDICIAL MIND

AND WHO HAVE NOT

ATTEMPTED TO PREJUDGE THE ISSUE.

31623

# CONTENTS.


PAGES

Preface . . . . . v– vii

Introductory . . . . . 1– 11

## Part I.

Analysis of readings in the Apocalypse with special reference to the Coptic . . . . . 13– 96

Notes on Latin and Syriac Versions . . . . . 97–111

Specimen pages of collation of Greek MSS. of Apocalypse . . . 112–116

## Part II.

Concerning the tendency of the scriptural quotations in the commentaries of the principal monastic writers of Egypt . . . . 117–192

Rough Index . . . . . 193–195

Index of Scriptural Quotations . . . . . 197–203

# HANDLIST OF GREEK MSS. OF APOC.

## TO NO. 123.

Missing or to be vacated 3 5 11 54 60 66 71 76 83 85 86 105.

Not collated $79^{a}$ 112 (duplicates).

Not yet collated 120 121 122.

As to Scr's list, 23 is substituted by Gregory and Hoskier for Scr. 86.

Eliminate $50^{2}$ of Scr. = 90 of *Tisch Greg* which we adopt.

Eliminate 85 Scr. (Esc. Ψ III. 17) = *Greg* and *Hosk* 142 (Esc. T III. 17).

(85 *Greg* Hierosol. S. Sepulcr. 9 we neglect).

Scr 86 = our 23. Greg 86 = S. Sabae 10. I do not use the number.

Greg $86^{2}$ and Greg 89 "S. Saba 20" I do not use, as Greg. numbers twice S. Saba 20 at 89 and 104, which is Scr's 105.

Our 89 is Scr's Burdett-Coutts = Paul 266.

99 and 100 we adopt for Gregory's Naples codices.

Our 101 is Scr's (Ev 206 Ac 94 P 107), the sister of Apoc 46–88. I prefer to use this number where it stands to Gregory's 109 for many reasons.

Beyond this

| | Scr and Hosk : = | Greg : | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 102 | 103 | |
| | 103 | 101 | |
| | 104 | 107 | |
| | 105 | 104 ? [we omit] | |
| | **106** | **106** | |
| | 107 | 181 | |
| (our 108) | 108 } 129 } | 129 | |
| | 109 | 102 | |
| | 110 | 113 | |
| | 111 | 105 | Athens. Not collated. Can get no information from library. |
| | 112 | 182 | |
| | 113 | 146 | Messina. Uncollated before the earthquake. |
| | 114 | 153 | |
| | (115 | 114 | Delete. Is part of 39.) |
| | (116 | 157 | Delete. Is com̄ without text.) |

31623

| Scr and Hosk : | = | Greg : | |
|---|---|---|---|
| (117 | | 115 | Neglect. Not Apoc.) |
| (118 | | 160 | Neglect. Derived from a printed edition.) |
| 119 | | 161 | |
| 120 | | 149 | Not yet collated by me. |
| 121 | | 150 | |
| 122 | | 151 | |
| **123** | | **123** | |

After this we run together for quite a spell to about 145.

GROUPS.

Erasmian 1–46=88=101–59–62=63–67–72.

Complutensian 10–17–(21)–37–49–77–91–96–110.

Stepping stones between them are such MSS. as 36 and possibly the group 7–16–39–45–69–102–104 which is a graeco-latin group.

Also 12 81 and 114 with all their vagaries.

Also the very important group 21–28–(65)–73–79–79$^{a}$–80–100 (from xi. on)–103–112, which group is interesting, comprising an old Egyptian text, good in parts but very independent, although containing the double element of Compl. and Erasmus texts (through the Syriac). Of this group 80 is as ancient as any, corelating the base of 1 62/3 and also giving valuable hints as to this classification.

65 has strong coptic spots, going with ℵ alone, or ℵ alone and *copt.*

Stepping stones between B and Compl.-Erasm. and the 21 groups are 108 and 109. 108** = 56.

56 is a new type and extremely interesting, related as to base with the earliest polyglot traditions.

Among MSS. less independent in view, yet giving a very good account of the best traditional text, may be ranked 47 as well as 22.

34 and 87 (with the more careless 35 and its sister 68) and such MSS. are somewhat more mixed, yet have value in determining many points. This fourfold group, very distinct, 34–35–68–87, appears to be an Arethas revision on an old Egyptian base (also covering Latin and Syriac at times).

38, while indulging in curiosities, and a very eclectic MS. not to be trusted as a whole, is very old indeed and furnishes several interesting keys; is largely related to 62 (or it to 38) and to both Erasmian and Compl. groups.

23 is a key MS. largely related to the earliest bilingual graeco-latin codices.

18 is a most important MS. with an exceedingly old base.

25–19**–58–70–78–84–94 are practically identical, 70 being the most accurate of the family.

Other families are:

44–52–82;
30–98–(with 29 partially);
9–27–75;
8–24;
6–31–106 (rather important);

13–23–55 represent one parent not so very old, but are not quite identical to-day.

26–41–42–53–107. 41–42 represent the B revision with a clinging tendency to the old ways; that is 41–42 have a mixed text of value, but showing transition.

108–109 are also interesting with survivals of *syr* S.

40 is an important key MS. though mixed and rather unsatisfactory, as is 90. 51–90 are cousins.

Of purer B texts we may rank the Arethas MSS. 4 20 48 64 74 with 32 *etc.* The base of 32 is old, but he is eclectic.

61–95 agree in a variety of unique readings up to the middle of ch. xi. and then go apart. At x.–xii. they are joined by 74, by some process unknown.

108** (from xxi. 14–xxii. 21) confirms all the 56 readings there and gives us a hint of the locality where 56 came from [Calabria? See under 104 and 108]. 56 then ranks first in importance of our new MSS.; 114 is also exceedingly interesting though a critical text; in many readings it takes us to readings of ℵAC and P not found in other cursives, yet its chief characteristics are of the I (Erasmian) family.

119 and 123, close sisters, follow soon after the exceptional 114, and open our eyes to the critical possibilities in cursive texts so far unveiled. 119–123 appear to carry us back to very old times and precede ℵ, for, where ℵ conflates ix. 20 + αυτων (*ante* ταυταις), 119–123 *substitute* αυτων for ταυταις!

119–123 further emphasize the great age of the Erasmian or I group, through its Syriac base. And our *textus receptus* of Apoc. turns out not to be so young as many people think.

Beyond this we have not gone yet, and must pause at this point.

We repeat the groups for reference :

1–46=88=101–59–62=63–67–72,
4–20–48–64–74,
6–31–106,
7–16–39–45–69–102–104,
8–24,
9–27–75,
10–17–(21)–37–49–77–91–96–110,
13–23–55,
14–92,
21–28–(65)–73–79–79$^{a}$–80–100–103–112,
25–19$^{**}$–58–70–78–84–94,
26–41–42–53–107,
30–(29)–98,
34–35–68–87,
44–52–82,
51–90,
[61–95–(74)],
119–123 ;

so that the student may know that where we quote cursives, although not always hyphenated, by reference to this table, the witnesses can be counted and reduced from as many as nine to one.

Important single MSS. are :

18.
32 (close to the 4–20 group and to 109).
36.
38 (compare 97).
40.
47.
56.
65.
(81).
95 = 61 and 74 but only partially.
108.
109 is a graeco-armenian MS.
114.

# PREFACE.

The interrelation of the Versions—Syriac, Latin and Coptic—is so intimate that the problem of dating these versions exactly has hitherto baffled our efforts.

The following study is a contribution in this direction. It covers but a small field, but shows action and reaction of a marked kind, and the added testimony drawn from scores of hitherto unexamined Greek documents should without doubt be of some use in balancing certain factors in the problem.

If we are encroaching on a field not strictly our own, the excuse is that scholars more capable and more closely related to the coptic department have been content to notice some of the phenomena in passing without offering any explanation of them; others they have barely noticed, and to many they have not called attention at all.

In view of the increased bohairic and sahidic materials brought together of late years—some published, and many yet unpublished, it is hoped to stimulate further serious research in this department by the present enquiry, and to ask those qualified to give an opinion if they will not examine afresh the many points of interest here raised.

The Dean of Wells has well said that enquiries of this nature often tend to elucidate problems in other departments of sacred criticism, and it is my humble wish that such may be the case in the present instance; and that critics, instead of cavilling at my

labours, or damning them with faint praise, condescension or ridicule, may be led to see that there is a deeper significance in the comparative study of the Versions and their interrelations, as also of their relation to the Greek recensions, than has hitherto been allowed by a small band of experts. For this interrelation pushes back to very early times, far earlier than has generally been supposed or admitted.

We can make but little progress until we understand the conflations of Origen, what gave rise to them, and what lies behind them.

My excuse for this publication is patent. Reviewers and critics have thrown doubt upon the interrelation of Bohairic and Latin as early as I see it, and have even denied the existence of a bohairic version before the VI^th^ or VII^th^ century, placing it at a period when the coptic languages were about to fade away.

To explain my position I wish to adduce certain *facts*. They do not represent the arguments of dilettantism, because many of the pictures have been before us and are available to view in the footnotes of sundry text books, as in Tischendorf's edition and in the editions of Mr. Horner's *boh*, and more recently of *sah*. But in order to bring out the full significance of the readings of some of the Greek witnesses and their relative apposition, it became necessary to examine a long array of junior Greek documents. This I have done,† and with Dean Gwynn's publication some years since of the important syriac texts of the Apocalypse, we are supplied with what we still lacked to take a comprehensive view of the situation.

I would therefore ask attention to the fact that when ℵ $\frac{\text{and}}{\text{or}}$ A are mentioned without cursive support as registering coptic readings, the situation is doubly interesting, for it means that none of our numerous new witnesses agree with them, although

† The picture is not yet quite complete, but I hope that the collations of the remaining Greek MSS. will soon be finished.

some of them cover the ground from which the stock of ℵ and A originated.

My excuse for analysing the writings of some of the Egyptian monks in the second section is that so far I have not seen any deductions drawn from certain marked characteristics which pervade their texts, and I believe a fresh study of the situation may throw additional light on Part I of this essay.

By those who are wrapped up in an impenetrable scholar's mantle of self-sufficiency I may be deemed to be travelling over well-worn ground. I leave it to the candid ones to decide whether I have marshalled new facts, or presented them in a more readable form than has hitherto been the case.

The Rev. George Horner has been kind enough to spare the time to look over my proofs, but I am alone responsible for all that appears in the following pages.

H. C. Hoskier.

Carr Bridge, N.B.
*August* 1911.

. . . As things are at present conducted, a sudden transition is made from sensible objects and particular facts to general propositions which are accounted principles, and round which, as round so many fixed poles, disputations and argument continually revolve. From the propositions thus hastily assumed all things are derived by a process compendious and precipitate, ill-suited to discovery but wonderfully accommodated to debate. The way that promises success is the reverse of this. It requires that we should generalise slowly, going from particular things to those which are but one step more general; from those to others of still greater extent, and so on to such as are universal. By such means we may hope to arrive at principles not vague and obscure, but luminous and well-defined . . . .

Bacon.

# INTRODUCTORY.

It is with some reluctance that I have decided to present a partial exhibition of the full argument which is in preparation as regards the text of the Apocalypse. But I claim to be a dealer in *facts* and not in theories, and therefore, at the risk of marring the complete picture of Syriac, Latin, and Coptic before the scribe of ℵ$^{gr}$, I propose to exhibit the coptic element in ℵ in the Apocalypse as an answer to those who think the bohairic version is later than the time of ℵ. We cannot indeed divorce the argument from the Latin altogether, and Latin influences will be seen intruding as well.

It would seem particularly appropriate to exhibit the coptic features in the book of the Revelation, as this work is admitted to have been the last book received into the coptic canon. Therefore the latest in point of date.

If we can show that the Apocalypse in bohairic was in the hands of ℵ in a graeco-coptic exemplar, we prove at any rate that the bohairic antedates ℵ and 400 A.D. How much earlier depends upon the date of the MS. which ℵ was copying, but it requires no great stretch of imagination to carry it to 250 or 200 A.D.

Serious students of Horner's text and apparatus may have already gathered some of the facts upon which our contention is based. Our object is to show *how* it occurred that ℵ is a witness to bohairic translation in his day by submitting a running commentary on the textual situation.

Naturally this presentation of proof may seem cold or even inadequate to any who do not follow the investigator step by step over the ground. Nor can I expect that the picture can be as compelling as if the full collation of all the Greek documents were submitted at the same time. The picture there is indeed very striking when you see ℵ alone among 120 Greek witnesses

agreeing with Coptic or Latin. We print specimen pages (112/116) in an endeavour to give the effect. We also print separately a hand-list of the Greek MSS. collated to date, which can be used apart from the essay in following the argument page by page.

I wish to state distinctly here that the self-same features are to be observed in the Gospels and Epistles as in the Apocalypse as to ℵ having had under his hand concurrent Syriac, Latin, and Coptic versions.

[Where the term *coptic* is used it means generally *boh*, but occasionally includes *sah*; it never means *sah* alone].

[For *sah* we use Goussen's edition 1895 and Balestri 1904; Balestri supplies none of the lacunae in Goussen].

The first point which should engage our attention is a preliminary consideration of whether ℵ used the *bohairic* or the *sahidic* version, which, as in the case of the other books of the New Testament, differ very materially.

Thus at Apoc. ix. 20 ℵ (with only one special cursive family of two MSS. 119–123 closely related to him) gives the unusual order και τα ξυλινα και τα λιθινα. This is witnessed to of all others only by *boh* and *syr* S, but not by *sah*, nor by the Latins.

Again xii. 9. *Boh* drops the και between διαβολος and ὁ σατανας, as does ℵ alone among Greeks, writing

(all *boh* MSS.) ⲡⲓⲇⲓⲁⲃⲟⲗⲟⲥ ⲡⲥⲁⲧⲁⲛⲁⲥ

while *sah* = ⲡⲇⲓⲁⲃⲟⲗⲟⲥ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲡⲥⲁⲧⲁⲛⲁⲥ

so that it was distinctly *boh* which ℵ followed.

(See xx. 2 where ℵ *adds* ὁ to διαβολος with *copt* against most Greeks.)

xiii. 7. CAP the 1 family and *Iren* and *sah* omit the first part of the verse και εδοθη *usque ad* νικησαι αυτους. Not *boh*, which goes with ℵ and the rest.

Again xviii. 16. μαργαριτη is given by ℵCAP 95 alone of Greeks for μαργαριταις of the rest. This is the equivalent of all *boh* MSS. (but one = ⲛⲓ) which write the singular ⲛⲉⲓⲓ ⲡⲓⲓⲓⲁⲣⲅⲁⲣⲓⲧⲏⲥ, while Goussen's *sah* is merely ⲉⲓ ⲓⲓⲁⲣⲅⲁⲣⲓⲧⲏⲥ, using the copula ⲉⲓ for και all through the verse, so that the singular seems to come really from *boh* to ℵCAP 95 and not from *sah*. *Prim*, alone of Latins apparently, gives *margarita*.

Again xix. 9. ℵ*P (with some cursives) omit του γαμου. This is agreed to by *boh* (all the MSS.) but *sah* has it.

On the other hand there are a few slight traces of *sah* rather than *boh* (as at x. 10, xiv. 13, xx. 12) and a strong one (although also Latin to some extent) at xxii. 14, where ℵA 38 have οι πλυνοντες τας στολας αυτων; 56 108** conflating both readings; while at xix. 5 ℵ* favors *sah* and ℵ$^{a}$ *boh*. In other places, as at xii. 12, a change of order by ℵ alone agrees with *both boh* and *sah*, although the two coptic versions use different verbs. See also vi. 2 *fin.*, viii. 11, xiii. 12, xix. 17.

But the impression made by a view of the whole field of the Apocalypse is such as to strengthen the view, and that very distinctly, that ℵ was using a graeco-coptic MS. with the *bohairic* version.

There may have been closer relations between *boh* and *sah* in the earliest days than obtain to-day (see vi. 2, xxii. 14). In fact, at the curious place xx. 8 where *copt* adds "*the servants and*" before τα εθνη, and ℵ adds παντα with *syr* S, a third Egyptian version, the middle Egyptian, seems to yield the nearest alliterative form which might have caused the confusion.†

With this short preliminary notice, let us take a view of some of the passages where we think we see the *bohairic* version behind ℵ, and then proceed to a more detailed review of the matter.

The important thing to remember is that after examining a hundred greek cursive MSS. (of every possible line of descent) the points to follow in nearly all cases covered by ℵ and *boh* remain peculiar to them. Also note that by this process most of the unique readings still recorded among Greeks are eliminated, leaving comparatively few unaccounted for.

iii. 3. For εαν ουν μη γρηγορησης *boh* substitutes "unless therefore thou *repent and* watch." *Cf.* ℵ* *alone* (with *Prim*) μετανοησης for γρηγορησης. (*Sah* follows the rest of the Greeks.)

v. 13. *Boh* [not *sah*] omits και υποκατω της γης. So ℵ and a few cursives.

---

† See *Horner* in the St. John volume of the *sahidic* version, published this year, vol. iii., page 390, as to *boh* and *sah* having once been closer than appears to-day. He refers to *sah codd* 73 111 134 and m$^{1}$ conforming to *boh*; and *boh codd* DΔE conforming to *sah* in Matthew (but not in Mark).

M$^{boh}$ also, he says, bears traces of *sah* influence, as also Γ. The peculiarity of *boh* F and K sometimes suggests *sah* affinity. We may add that *sah* MS. 113$^{a}$ shows traces of very ancient handling.

v. 13. εν τη θαλασση (*pro* επι της θαλασσης) ℵ (alone) *boh syr lat.* All Greeks have επι, except 114 = υπο.
*Sah* retaining "and under the earth" merely adds ⲁⲩⲱ ⲑⲁⲗⲁⲥⲥⲁ, reading "and under the earth and sea," turning the difficulty and approximating 114.

vi. 2 *fin.* ℵ is quite alone with *boh* and *sah*, writing νικων και ενικησεν for νικων και ινα νικηση. This is a particularly noteworthy place as to Egypt and ℵ. For the Latins are quite clear thereagainst with "*vincens ut vinceret*," while only *syr* S and *Gr* 32 36 show knowledge of the Egyptian form by conflating. In fact *sah* in *Balestri* conflates: ⲉⲫⲭⲣⲟⲉⲓⲧ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲁⲫⲭⲣⲟ· ϫⲉⲕⲁⲥ ⲉⲫⲉⲭⲣⲟ while *Goussen* only ⲉⲫⲭⲣⲁⲉⲓⲧ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲁⲫⲭⲣⲟ.

vii. 16. ℵ and 53 only omit ετι *prim.* So *boh*, but not *sah* (*syr* S and 36 omit twice).

viii. 9. + μερος *primo loco* ℵ 34–35–68–87 36 *copt latt.*

11. ℵ* alone writes αψινθιον (for αψινθος or ο αψινθος) with *boh* and *sah.*

xi. 9. των φυλων και λαων ℵ only with *syr* S agrees with *boh* order (against *sah*).

xii. 8. For + προς αυτον of ℵ and coptic see full note beyond.

17. For επι λοιπων of ℵ and coptic see explanation beyond.

xiii. 12. προσκυνιν for ινα προσκυνησωσι by ℵ = *boh* and *sah* and *Latt* (except *Iren Prim Anonym gig*).

17. Order of ℵ 38 το χαραγμα του θηριου η το ονομα αυτου = *boh.*

[Already please to observe we have regular substitutions, transpositions, omission, and addition; now after following coptic form at viii. 11, we have an instance of *error oculi*]:

xiv. 19. For εις την γην ℵ 38 97 write επι της γης. *Boh* = ⲉⲡⲕⲁⲣⲓ not really greek επι but *looks* like it [*sah* wanting].

xv. 3. αδοντας ℵ and 119–123 only (for αδουσιν) = *boh* (and *syr* and some Latins) [*sah* wanting throughout *ch.* xv.].

xvi. 19 *fin.* — αυτου ℵ alone and *gig* with *boh* exactly [*sah* wanting].

xvii. 9. επτα βασιλεις εισιν ℵ and *boh* [*sah* wanting].

10. *Cf.* μινεζει of ℵ* alone (for δει μειναι) and *boh* "he will stay a little" or "he stays a little."

xviii. 6. — και (*ante* διπλωσατε) ℵ 23 and some *boh* MSS. [*sah* wanting].

xviii. 12. μαργαριτων ℵ 35–87 59 95 with *syr gig* and *boh* [*sah* wanting].

*ibid.* βυσσινων ℵ absolutely alone with *boh* MSS. ADHZ ⲛⲓⲱⲉⲛⲥ [*sah* wanting].

19. επι της κεφαλης αυτων (for επι τας κεφαλας αυτων) ℵ 59 only with *boh* "upon their head" [*sah* wanting].

*ibid.* ουαι *semel* ℵ only of uncials with fifteen cursives and *boh* (*boh* adds "to her" as usual ⲟⲩⲟⲓ ⲛⲁⲥ but only has the ουαι once) [*sah* wanting].

21. + οτι (*ante* ουτως). Only ℵ 16–39–69 102. = *boh* + ⲭⲉ [*sah* wanting].

22. — πασης τεχνης ℵA only and *boh*. No Greek cursives nor Latin. [See below for A and *copt* elsewhere.]

xix. 17. αλλον αγγελον for ενα αγγελον ℵ 36 and *syr* S, also ενα αλλον αγγελον by the Egyptian group 34–35–87. This + αλλον (ⲉⲕⲉⲁⲅⲅⲉⲗⲟⲥ) is added by both *boh* and *sah*.

xx. 8. — τον (ante γωγ) ℵ* only of Greeks (with Latin of course) and *boh* plainly ⲧⲱⲧ, while *sah* has ⲛ̄ⲧⲱⲧ.

xxi. 4. — ετι ℵ. *Cf. copt* in full note beyond as to this matter. Apparent confusion by ℵ between *bohairic* ⲭⲉ and ⲉⲡⲓⲗⲏ, heightened by substitution of προβατα for πρωτα (*latt priora*, as well as *prima*, *pristina*), and substitution by *syriac* of προσωπα. This place should be weighed in connection with a basic polyglot of *gr-syr-lat* in which there was confusion at this place.

20. τοπαδιον ℵ* alone. So the *boh* MSS. DN.

21. ℵ 65 omit δωδεκα *sec.* *Cf. boh* exactly "and the twelve gates of pearl."

xxii. 6. + με *ante* αγγελον ℵ*26–41–42–53–107 only. "And the Lord God sent *me* his angel to show to his servants . . ." A reference to *boh* shows to the eye ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲫⲁⲅⲅⲉⲗⲟⲥ, while *sah* (as extant in *Goussen*) exhibits more forcibly ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲓⲡⲉⲫⲁⲅⲅⲉⲗⲟⲥ. And this has nothing to do with the Latins. A later syriac (see *syr*$^{sch}$) seems also very definitely to have this με.

As to other points compare:

i. 16. φαινει ως ο ηλιος ℵ = *coptic* order with *h* and *Cypr* "splendebat ut sol."

ii. 1. + χειρα ℵ 34–35–68–87 = *copt.*

5. — ταχει ℵCAP 56 *syr* S *latt* = *copt.*

ii. 9. — τα εργα και ℵAP 47 *syr* S *latt* = *copt.*
13. — τα εργα σου και ℵCAP 38 *syr* S *latt* = *copt.*
17. — ὃ ℵ* 28 = *copt.*
iii. 16. οτι ουτως (for ουτως οτι) ℵ alone = *copt* exactly and *cf. latt* sed quia.
v. 5. — ο ων ℵ 14 28** 32 *syr* S *latt* = *copt.*
vi. 4. και ειδον και ιδον εξηλθεν ℵ. *Cf. copt* [*non sah*].
9. + των ανθρωπων ℵP 1 *etc.* = *copt.*
13. επι (*pro* εις) ℵ 22 23 47 55** 56 81 102 *syr* S *latt* = *copt.*
*ibid.* απο (*pro* υπο) ℵ* 14–92 31** *syr. Cf. copt.*
viii. 9. ψυχην ℵ 46–88–101 *syr* S. *Cf. copt.*
ix. 2. — και ηνοιξε το φρεαρ της αβυσσου ℵB *etc.* and *copt.*
13 *init.* — και ℵ 56 *syr* S = *copt.*
17. επανω (*pro* επ) ℵ. *Cf. copt* ϩⲓϫⲱⲟⲩ.
† x. 1. η θριξ (*pro* ιρις) ℵ*. *Cf. copt* ϯⲓⲣⲓⲥ.
4. οσα (*pro* α) ℵ 18 = *copt.*
xi. 15. + αμην ℵ 12 18 38 40 only of Greeks, some Latt and some *copt* MSS.
17. ΚϹ ο ΘϹ (*pro* κυριε ο θεος). *Cf. copt* ⲡⲟ̅ⲥ̅.
xiii. 14. πληγης (*pro* την πληγην) ℵ. *Cf. copt.*
† xvi. 3. ωσι (*pro* ως) ℵ. *Cf. copt* ⲙ̅ⲫⲣⲏϯ (*cf.* xvi. 13).
6. + οπερ ℵ. *Cf. copt* + ϫⲉ *et am* + ut.
8. [*Habet* αγγελος] ℵ *et copt contra* CABP *etc.*
16. — τον (*ante* τοπον) ℵ 62–3 72. *Cf. copt et latt.*
xvii. 2. εποιησαν πορνειαν (*pro* επορνευσαν) ℵ alone. *Cf. copt.*
xviii. 14. απωλοντο ℵ and fourteen cursives. *Cf. copt et lat.*
xix. 4. — ζωα ℵ with *copt* C*.
5. — και *sec.* ℵCP with *copt* B.
9. — του γαμου ℵ*P twenty cursives *gig* = *copt* [*non sah*].
16. — επι *sec.* ℵ 12 62–3 72 and both coptics.
xx. 1. εν τη χειρι αυτου (*pro* επι την χειρα αυτου) ℵ 38 *syr lat* = *copt.*
2. + ο (*ante* διαβολος) ℵ and eleven notable cursives (representing but three or four families) = *copt* [*contra lat*].
6. + τα (*ante* χιλια) ℵB fourteen cursives = *copt.*
xxi. 9. την νυμφην την γυναικα του αρνιου ℵAP 34–35–87 38 65 77 *syr* S *lat* = *copt* and *sah.*

---

† Such things are only mentioned here to ask attention to them in the discussion which follows.

xxii. 8. ο βλεπων και ακουων ταυτα ℵ twenty-seven cursives *syr* S *Dionys* = *copt* and *sah.*

A peculiar place may also be noticed at ii. 22, where for βαλλω (βαλω ℵ$^{a}$BP and eleven cursives future tense) ℵ* wrote καλω. This *Tertullian* gives as *dabo* with *boh* (ⲧⲛⲁⲧⲏⲓⲥ), while *sah* is ⲧⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩⲭⲉ. Both future, but ⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩⲭⲉ = projiciam, while *boh* ⲧⲛⲁⲧⲏⲓⲥ is clearly *dabo.* The question is: what made ℵ* write καλω?

Turning to the correctors of ℵ, note as to ℵ$^{a}$:

v. 1. + και (*ante* εσφραγισμενον) ℵ$^{a}$ 13–23–55 27 90 *boh syr* S but no Latins, and not *sah.*

vi. 4. — αυτω (*post* εδοθη) ℵ$^{a}$ with A only and MS. 31 of Greeks, with the Latins *gig Prim* and *Anonym* only. *Cf. boh* which brings ⲫⲏ very early in the verse, and *cf. sah.*

ix. 13. See beyond under A$^{gr}$.

xiv. 8. ℵ* here omits 8/9 from homoioteleuton. ℵ$^{a}$ supplies, and alone substitutes πεπτωκαν, with *boh* ⲁⲩϫⲉⲓ, for πεποτικεν of other Greeks, reading "*all the nations* FELL" instead of "*all the nations* DRANK." This is noteworthy, for we see ℵ* using coptic almost involuntarily, and then ℵ$^{a}$ here witnesses, probably in the very same place (as διορθωτης), to a distinctly *bohairic* reading, perhaps in the self-same graeco-coptic copy which ℵ* had been using. [This is corrector C$^{a}$, see Lake's new edition of ℵ.]

xix. 5. This also is interesting. ℵ$^{a}$ corrects ℵ* from και φωναι εξηλθον to και φωνη εξηλθεν, which agrees with *boh.* Goussen's *sah* does not begin until verse 6, but an arabic note in A$^{copt}$ says *sah* is wrong with και φωναι εξηλθον. ℵ$^{a}$ also corrects λεγουσαι to λεγουσα.

Note further that the *order* of both ℵ* and ℵ$^{a}$ of και φων. εξηλθ. agrees with *copt* against all other Greeks and Latins (except *Prim*) και φων. εκ του θρονου εξηλθ.

xxi. 6. — γεγοναν ℵ$^{a}$ (ℵ* γεγονα with A; ℵ$^{a}$ adds ν, then takes it away and marks the whole word for deletion). This omission of ℵ$^{a}$ alone among Greeks has the countenance of *boh* [not *sah*] with *aeth*? *lux* and *Anonym Tich* only. (See Tischendorf's notes in editio minor of ℵ rather than his note in N.T. ed. VIII.)

xxii. 20. Note that ℵ$^{a}$ removes ειναι of ℵ*. ℵ* (following perhaps

a corrupt graeco-bohairic text; see Horner, note) has something approximating *boh*'s "They will happen and they come quickly." ℵ[a] removes this.

xxii. 20. In the same verse ℵ[a] (with many cursives) adds χριστε, which is the reading of *boh*.

[Now consider ℵ[c] as to the MS. remaining in Egypt or having returned thither.

xi. 8. *Boh* and *sah* insert a verb "shall be" before επι της πλατειας. So do 21–28 37 73–79–80–103 εασει, and ℵ[c] εσται. Also *latt* "jacebunt" (*Prim* "ponet"; *cf. Prim Tich* and *Anon ad loc.*).

12. ηκουσα (*pro* ηκουσαν) by ℵ[a] or ℵ[c] = *boh sah, gig Anon*, but not other Latins.

xii. 6. See note further on.

xix. 7. η νυμφη for η γυνη ℵ[c] alone, with *sah copt* and *Latins*. See note further on. While ℵ[c] was in the habit of accommodating to the Latin, and very likely followed it here, yet we see from *sah* and *boh* that it already existed there when ℵ* was copying. Yet ℵ* did not follow, for his Greek ἡ γυνη αυτου could mean nothing else than *uxor*. The *coptic* holds the αυτου, but writes distinctly ϣⲉⲗⲉⲧ = *sponsa* as in *gig*.]

We will now turn to ℵA in combination, to show that this matter is a fixed Egyptian tradition (besides the Latin part of the original graeco-latin stem).

We have just seen ℵ[a] and A in conjunction (vi. 4); now see ℵ*A together:

v. 10. βασιλειαν (*pro* βασιλεις) ℵA 56 *copt latt.*

ix. 12. ερχεται (*pro* ερχονται) ℵ*A and a good many cursives and *boh* [not the Latins].

x. 11. λεγουσιν (*pro* λεγει) ℵAB *etc. boh* [*non sah*]. [Not the Latins except *Harl* and *am**].

xi. 11. εν αυτοις (*pro* επ αυτους) A *etc.*; εις αυτους ,, ,, ,, ℵB *etc.* } *boh sah latt.*

16. — οἱ *prim.* ℵ*A 72 only with *boh* (and of course *latt*) (see note on this verse further on).

xvi. 2. See note further on as to ℵA.

14. — εκεινης ℵA with only 38 95 and 14–92 = *coptic* [*hiat sah*] and *vg* with *gig* [against *Prim* and *Auct de prom*] *aeth arm Tich Haymo.*

xviii. 22. — πασης τεχνης ℵA and *boh* [*hiat sah*]. No Latins, no Greek cursives. Hippolytus has it. Surely this is very noteworthy.

xxii. 5. + φωτος *ante* λυχνου ℵA 18 47 56 80 108** *syr* S. } *cf. copt* and note further on.
+ φως „ „ 21–73–79–100–103 65 *latt.* } *cf. copt* and note further on.

As to ℵC and *copt*:

xiii. 17 *init.* — και ℵ*C some cursives *syr Hipp Iren Anonym* = *boh sah* and *latt* against the rest.

As to C and *copt*:

xviii. 18. + ταυτη C 104 *latt* = *boh* [*sah* wanting].

As to ℵP:

xix. 9. — του γαμου ℵ*P certain cursives *gig* [*not* other Latins] is agreed to by *boh* but not by *sah*.

(ℵ[a] with his Latin before him adds and does not recognize the omission).

See also xvii. 16 *etc.*

As to ℵAP:

xxii. 5. ετι (*pro* εκει) ℵAP 35–68 56 65 108** (108** = 56) all noteworthy cursives = *latt* with *copt*.

Now for the picture finally of A alone and *copt*, which absolutely ties A down to Egyptian soil.

ii. 2. — και (*ante* οτι). A alone and *boh* [not *sah*].

23 *init.* — και A (with two cursives but opposing their sister MSS.) = *boh* and *sah*.

iv. 11. ο κυριος και ο θεος ημων A alone, among many variations, seems nearest to *boh* and *sah* (*cf.* also 21 119: κυριος ο θεος ημων).

vi. 4 *fin.* μεγαλη μαχαιρα A = *copt* and *sah* order against all Greeks and Latins.

13. A alone writes θεου for ουρανου, no doubt due to confusion of *coptic* [as in the Gospels, the Freer MS. (we are authorized to say) shows an overlying bohairic or sahidic influence, giving ουρανου for θεου, from the propinquity of the coptic word for kingdom ⲙⲉⲧⲟⲩⲣⲟⲩ, or possibly from apparent similarity of the words for "God" and "Heaven" in *sahidic*.]

vii. 3. και (*pro* μητε *prim.*) A 38 106 *vg*. *Cf. boh sah* ⲛⲉⲙ and *vg* "et" with *am harl*** *lips*.

[*Tisch* adds 41–42 of Greeks. I have not noted this for these MSS.].

vii. 9. — και ιδου. A alone with *syr* S *boh* and *sah* and *latt* and *Cypr bis.*

ix. 13. — τεσσαρων A 14–92 18 21–28–73–79–103 and *boh* and *sah* and *some* Latins *am fu harl lips tol.* See Tischendorf's note. *Cf.* ℵ* and addition of ℵ[a] without τεσσαρων.

x. 2. — ανεωγμενον A alone of Greeks with *boh* [*sah* wanting]. And not all of Horner's *boh*, but only three, *viz.* AD[mg]N. Surely this also is most noteworthy. These things have been carefully tabulated by Tischendorf. Why think of rejecting Egypt as the home and origin of A then at this late date?

xi. 18. — και (*ante* διαφθειραι) A 21–73 and *boh* only [not *sah*] as often does *boh* in such descriptions. This also seems significant. *Tisch* does not note this as to *copt.*

19. As to CA *etc.* see beyond in the general tabulation.

xii. 8. ισχυσεν *copt* with A and many cursives including 34–35–87. See longer note beyond.

16. το υδωρ (*pro* τον ποταμον) A only. *Cf. copt* τον ποταμον υδατος as in verse 15 [*sah* τον ποταμον].

(xiii. 10. — δει A. *Cf. copt*).

xiv. 1. + το (*ante* γεγραμμενον) A. *Cf. copt.*

9. αυτω (*pro* αυτοις) A alone. *Cf.* some of Horner's codices.

10. — αγιων A 26 77* 107 108 = *boh* [*non sah*].

(xv. 4. See note beyond).

xvi. 2, 4, 17. See notes beyond.

18. ανθρωπος εγενετο (*pro* οι ανθρωποι εγενοντο) A (and 38 only: εγενετο ανθρωπος) = *boh* [*non sah*].

xvii. 8. "they whose name" *Cf.* AB *etc.*

15. ειπεν (*pro* λεγει) A alone. *Cf. copt syr* S.

(xvii. 17. — και ποιησαι μιαν γνωμην A *etc.* See beyond).

xviii. 12. *bis in versu.* As to μαργαριταις A and *copt*, and σκευος for ξυλον A see beyond.

16. μαργαριτη ℵCAP 95 (no others) = all *boh* MSS. but one.

22. — πασης τεχνης ℵA and *boh* alone (we have already referred to under ℵA together).

xix. 20. οι μετ αυτου (*pro* μετα τουτου) A 32 41 = *copt.*

(xx. 2. ο οφις ο αρχαιος A. *Cf. syr* S *copt.*)

xxi. 5. + και (*ante* ιδου) A alone. Note + χε introductory, *sah* and *boh.*

xxii. 19. — εκ A 10 38. *Cf. boh.*

21 *fin.* — αμην A 21 58* 59 67 73–79–80 81 *boh* [*habet sah*].

After this preliminary and I hope instructive exhibition, we will let a general commentary follow, for without it any consideration of the peculiar turns of versions would be out of order. But here, if the student will be at the pains to follow, he will see the general coptic trend coupled with its "intervention" † as a version in quite early times.

We may add here that the question of Biblical interrelation between Latin-speaking Africa and Greek-Coptic-speaking Egypt has been questioned. We would therefore call attention to the place at ii. 22 where *Tertullian* writes *dabo* for βαλλω or βαλω of Greeks (καλω ℵ). *Dabo* is exactly as *bohairic* expresses it, using the future ⲛⲁ = ⲧⲛⲁⲧⲏⲓⲥ, but *sah* adds the ⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩⲭⲉ *projiciam* of others.

But we will reserve a few more words as to the Latin to complete the picture after printing the running commentary which follows.

We wish to confine our proofs here of the existence of the *bohairic* version in Aleph's day (no doubt ℵ is circa 350–400 A.D.) as to an *overlying* coptic influence on ℵ's greek.

Although the scribe of ℵ was Greek-Coptic = Egypt, yet he seems to have had under his eye or in his mind a Latin version, so that Alexandria vindicates in him its trilingual character apart from Latin "Africa," but the Latin with the Syriac formed also in a large measure the characteristics of his *underlying* text. See beyond the commentary pp. 14 (i. 16), 19 (v. 13), 27 (ix. 20), 36 (xii. 11), 40 (xiii. 2), 41 (xiii. 12), 47 (xiv. 18), 48 (xv. 2, xv. 3), 50 (xv. 3), 57 (xvi. 14), 58 (xvi. 19), 61 (xvii. 16, 18), 62 (xviii. 2), 64 (xviii. 11), 65 (xviii. 14), 73 (xix. 17), 74 (xix. 20 *bis*), 77 (xx. 8), 81 (xxi. 3, 4), 83 (xxi. 6), 88/89 (xxi. 27), 89 (xxii. 1), 89/90 (xxii. 2), 91 (xxii. 6), 93 (xxii. 14), 95 (xxii. 17), 105/107 *etc.*

---

† This expression I think we owe to the Rt. Rev. F. H. Chase, Bishop of Ely. It is an excellent one.

# PART I.

## The Coptic Versions of the Apocalypse.

An examination of Horner's bohairic shows that as a rule his mss. exhibit a wonderful unanimity in this book, and that notwithstanding a large number of unique variants in the coptic. *Boh* and *sah* on the other hand are not at all in accord any more than in other books of the N.T., yet occasionally very perfect basic agreement is to be found, sometimes apart from the Greek.

Testing the coptic with the small "Egyptian" group 34–35–68–87 we are struck early by very forceful agreement with the coptic. This, however, soon gives place to absolute disagreement in a number of important details. Therefore, in a large measure this Greek group is independent.

A most patent thing develops, however, as regards ℵ, who is nearer *copt* than this cursive group, having several quite unique agreements with the coptic. A also in places shows the same feature.

The difference between the 34 group and copt might indicate a late date for coptic Apoc., yet (1) when we consider that Horner's codices *agree among themselves*, and (2) that frequently *gig* and *syr* S support *copt* (often with *sah*) in strange places, we are forced to conclude that *copt* ranges with the earliest Syriac and Latin and has weight.

Its aberrations (appearing largely fundamental) must be due to the opportunity to enlarge and enhance the graphic character of the narrative, and to "accommodate" to similar diction in other parts of the book. For details refer to the following account.

We may learn a good deal here. *Syr* S and Σ seem to be often very close to coptic. The family we have called 'Egyptian': 34–35–68–87 is shown to be very close to coptic at times. This can be seen in the first chapter, where i. 4 *fin.* αυτου is omitted by 35 and *copt* alone, while in i. 5 the construction ὁς ηγαπησεν . . ελουσεν is given, as in *copt*, by 34–35–87 and 102** only; yet they

do not follow at i. 7 οψονται for κοψονται, where apparently *all* Horner's codices make this error, which only 102 and *h* retain, while αυτον for επ' αυτον following is also read by ℵ* 102 *h* with *copt*.

56, while having certain sympathy (i. 3 μακαριοι οι αναγινωσκοντες, 56 only of Greeks with *copt*), does not run freely with *copt* as 34–35–87.

Such MSS. as 36, while of syriac proclivities, do not favor *copt* except in spots. This can be seen at i. 3, where 36 alone writes οτι ο καιρος εγγυς for the ο γαρ καιρος εγγυς of the Greeks, the coptic retaining γαρ literatim. 34–35–87 are really however a clear Egyptian *Greek* type, probably antedating the coptic. They do not follow in such things as i. 9, where the construction is quite different and εν τη θλιψει και (εν τη) βασιλεια και υπομονη Ιησου Χριστου becomes 'in the tribulations because the kingdom and thy endurance were in Jesus.' Yet 50 shows a trace of this here [50 is with two coptic MSS. in an unusual inscription, '*Apocalypse of the holy John.*'] Perhaps even 59, which is with *copt* alone at i. 20 + επτα (*ante* αγγελοι) and often later.

The above sympathy with *h* prepares us for + μοι *post* λεγουσης (or λεγουσαν) of *copt* ALONE with *h* in i. 11. *Copt* follows this (alone) with 'hear' for 'see,' but *h* is mutilated and yields no testimony, unless the editors read the first letter right *u*, beginning of *vides*, and not *a*. Compare immediately after the *copt* ετε for εις *ante* εφεσον. No Greeks thus. But *harl* omits this εις.

i. 16. *Coptic* order of ℵ φαινει ως ο ηλιος = *h Cypr* splendebat ut sol.

We pick up *copt* and ℵ* 34–35–68–87 at once in ii. 1 + χειρα.

[We may say here that the place where ℵ was written seems to us almost certainly to be Egypt and not elsewhere].†

Just as ii. 2 — και ante οτι of A corresponds only to *copt* [*non sah*].

At ii. 5. *copt* omits ταχει with only ℵCAP and 56 of Greeks and *syr* S *gig vg*.

---

† We find ourselves thus in agreement with Professor Lake in his Introduction to that most valuable contribution to our critical materials—the new edition of ℵ. Our essay, I hope, will supplement and fill in some gaps in the studies of Harnack and Lake.

As regards B and Alexandria the situation is more complicated, and in Part II. of this essay nothing has been said of Athanasius, because it seems to involve a separate study.

ii. 9. *copt* omits τα εργα και with a somewhat different group = ℵAP 47 *syr* S *gig harl vg.*

13. *copt* omits τα εργα σου και with ℵCAP 38 this time *syr* S *gig harl vg.*

Such things as the above five points are interesting as to a polyglot, for in the coptic is very much difference which finds no place whatever in the Greeks ℵCAP nor in 34–35–68–87 nor in 56. If the Greeks had consulted the coptic version they would have surely changed some other things. They merely wandered to it occasionally by chance as it were. Thus γραψον begins the various verses in coptic. Not so any Greeks, and there are many other things too lengthy to mention in this brief sketch.

Different seems the omission of ο μισω or ομοιως at ii. 15 with 38 104 109[arm], *aeth*, for the coptic closes at ⲛ̅ⲛⲓⲕⲟⲗⲁⲓⲧⲱⲛ, and the sahidic at ⲛ̅ⲛⲓⲕⲟⲗⲁⲓⲧⲏⲥ.

Again ii. 16. και is substituted for ει δε μη by all Horner's coptic codices except A*N, while his TC and A[mg] conflate with *syr* S και ει δε μη. No Greeks.

Again ii. 17. Horner translates "I shall give to him from the hidden manna" (– φαγειν). He has 'from' then, ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲉⲛ (which 34–35–68–87 omit, writing του μαννα φαγειν [– απο]). In ℵ and *syr* S αυτω φαγειν is omitted, and in CAB *etc.* φαγειν απο is omitted. Coptic therefore steers its own course rather wide: "I shall give to him from in the hidden manna."

Same verse. – ὃ of ℵ*28 is answered to by coptic; and for οιδεν or εγνω, coptic substitutes ⲛⲁϥ with 26 33 59 88 92 *txt* 101 106 108 ειδεν. Note 108 here (the counterpart of 56) but not 56.

ii. 22. ℵ* says καλω for βαλλω or βαλω ℵ[a]P *etc.*: but *Tert* dabo = *boh* ⲧⲛⲁⲧⲏⲓⲥ while *sah* is ⲧⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩϫⲉ.

*ibid.* μετανοηση for μετανοησωσιν 56 only = *copt* and *sah.*

In 56 followed by εκ των εργων αυτης (with most, but not *syr* S) while half the coptic MSS. omit the clause altogether and the others insert it with αυτης *fin.* Horner omits the clause from his text. It is present in Goussen's sahidic. He reads ⲙⲉⲧⲁⲛⲟⲉⲓ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲥⲛ̅ ⲛⲉⲥⲥⲃⲏⲟⲩⲉ.

ii. 23 *init.* – και by A (+ 16 and 77, which hardly count, as they oppose sister MSS.) is supported by the coptic.

Same verse. Matter of order: καρδιας και νεφρους by 51–90 and

the important cursive 114 and *Vict Tun* is given thus by *coptic* (apparently every single one of Horner's MSS.) but *not* by *sah.*

Same verse. 38 alone supports αυτου *fin.* for υμων. Thus coptic all MSS. and *latt vg lips tol Cypr Quaest* (*cf. Vict Tun*).

So do such cursives apparently show the deepest knowledge of coptic variants.

ii. 25. The αχρις ου αν ηξω is rendered by *copt* (and *sah*) as ϣⲁϯⲓ = donec *venio.* 56 has ελθω and 81 has αν ελθω as the Latin *vg harl Auct quaest Anonym* donec veniam.

iii. 1. The addition of κυριος by 34–35–87 before ο εχων finds apparently no counterpart in *copt.*

3. For εαν ουν μη γρηγορησης *copt* substitutes "unless therefore thou repent and watch." *Cf.* μετανοησης for γρηγορησης of ℵ* alone with *Prim. Sah* goes with ordinary Greek.

Same verse. For ποιαν ωραν *cf.* ποια ωρα of 12 22 23, qua hora *latt*, "the hour in which" *copt.*

iii. 4. We have passed over many unique readings of *copt.* Here is one: "these which polluted not their garments *with woman*" (ϲϩⲓⲙⲓ) which is not found in any Greek copies,

nor in iii. 8, where *copt* adds "with thy faith" after σου τα εργα. See also iii. 15/16 and 17, which are interesting.

iii. 5. εξαλειψωσι of 21 (104*) for εξαλειψω. *Cf. copt.*

9. "All shall know" *copt*, for Greek γνωσιν. *Cf.* γνωσονται of 36 56 67 *syr* S.

10. — της ωρας *copt* is only omitted by *syr* S besides.

14. *Copt* starts all these verses with γραψον (ϲϧⲁⲓ). Hitherto no Greeks agree. Here 15 agrees to drop και *init.*

16. οτι ουτως ℵ alone (*for* ουτως οτι) = *copt* exactly. ⲭⲉ ⲡⲁⲓⲣⲏϯ (*cf. latt*).

18. — παρ εμου omitted by 34–35–68–87 and 31 97, is not omitted by *copt*, which emphasizes it.

Same verse *fin. Cf.* αναβλεψης of 59 102 (for βλεπης) to *copt*: ⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲕⲛⲁⲩ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟϥ.

iii. 19. + ⲅⲁⲣ *copt. Cf.* 21 εγω δε [*non latt*].

Same verse. "Be zealous then *for the good*" *copt*. *Cf.* gloss *ex com.* which 21 (23) 73–79 insist upon incorporating in the text.

The double presence here of 21 is instructive. (Crede ergo *Prim* only).

iv. 6. — και κυκλω του θρονου *copt* and 28 29 30 67 98 109$^{gr\ et\ arm}$ *harl Anonym* but not 34–35–68–87 [while *gig* omits the other part of the clause και εν μεσω του θρονου].

But iv. 7. 35 joins *copt* (and *gig Victorin*) adding ομοιον after the third living creature [*cf.* ℵ and 15].

iv. 8. This whole verse is differently rendered from any by *copt*, beginning by omitting the first words και τεσσαρα ζωα (not so *sah*). It then proceeds "and each one of them" (literally 'and the one the one of them') "all over" (txt Horner = ⲉⲩⲕⲱ† ⲉⲣⲱⲟⲩ, his margin 'encircling'). This addition stands in place of + εστως by the group 34–35–68–87 with *syr* S. Not so apparently Goussen's *sah* either, which has ⲏⲛⲏⲧⲏ as Tattam edited. If so all three recensions *copt*, *sah*, 34 *etc.* differ. *Copt* then proceeds quite differently up to the trisagion.

Same verse. Curiously enough, the order ο ων και ο ην of some twenty cursives is agreed to by *copt*, but this does *not* include the Egyptian group 34–35–68–87.

iv. 9. The οταν of Greeks may be *conditional* in both *copt* (ⲁⲣⲉϣⲁⲛ) and *sah* (ⲉⲣϣⲁⲛ), translated by Horner "And *if* the four living beings *should* give," but can be rendered equally well "But when the four living beings give." No Greeks thus with εαν, but ℵ 67 81 92 write δωσωσιν, and B and others δωσωσι.

10. *Copt* turns the phrase, omitting ενωπιον του καθ. επι του θρονου and adding ενωπιον before τω ζωντι. Not so the Greeks. *Prim Fulg Vigil Taps* omit του καθημενου επι with 63 81 *gig*.

11. The simpler form of A ο κυριος και ο θεος ημων seems to be the way *copt* expresses it.

Same verse. Compare the του λαβειν of 56 with *copt* ⲉⲥⲧ.

*Copt* says 'and thy will was done' for και δια το θελημα σου εισι. There seems to be no variation among the Greeks except that A writes δια θεληματι.

v. 1. + και *ante* κατεσφραγ. *Copt* (not *sah*) and so *syr* S with ℵ[a] 13 23 27 55 90 *Orig* (not 34 *etc.*).

2. *Copt* does *not* supply the αλλον of 34–35–68–87 *syr* S *Orig*, so that it is perfectly clear already that this small Egyptian family partakes of the *double* syriac and coptic, and that must be very early.

Same verse. "This book" copt; no Greeks.

So also ανοιξαι *pro* λυσαι some *copt* (with *Cypr* 1/2 only). *Cypr* actually says: accipere librum et aperire signa; no Greeks.

v. 4. "And they all were weeping" for 'και εγω εκλαιον πολλα (or πολυ)' says *copt*, but no Greeks, nor do others omit πολυ. But 1 114 123? have πολλοι. [ⲁⲛⲟⲕ ⲇⲉ ⲁⲓⲣⲓⲙⲉ ⲉⲙⲙⲁⲧⲉ *sah Balestri*, ⲁⲩⲱ ⲁⲓⲣⲓⲙⲉ ⲉⲙⲙⲁⲧⲉ *sah* Goussen.]

5. ℵ (with 14 28** 32) now reappears in the combination *syr* S *gig* and *copt* in omitting ὁ ων [ων omitted by nearly all others]. This is rather noteworthy, for *copt* preserves the Greek order exactly with ενικησεν before the Lion.

7. Horner translates ⲑⲟⲩⲓⲙⲁⲙⲉ 'right hand,' which is legitimate enough, but the Greek is δεξιας only, which should be noticed, as 16–39–69–102 supply της χειρος and *syr* S writes χειρος for δεξιας. *Sah* confirms ⲧⲟⲩⲙⲁⲙⲉ; so *copt* and *sah* agree to reproduce the Greek strictly without ⲧⲟⲧ or ⲭⲓⲭ.

8. For μεστας of 7–16–39–45–69–102 instead of γεμουσας compare *copt* and *sah* ⲉⲩⲙⲉϩ.

9. In this important verse, which *coptic* (and *sah*) render truthfully as the Greek, we find the order ημας τω θεω of *copt gig* covers a few cursives including 34–35–68–87, so that this is the *true* coptic base. The only difference coptic makes afterwards is to add 'every' after γλωσσης and λαου and εθνους as well as after φυλης, which the Greeks do not do.

10. Coptic changes the construction just as the Greek, but has βασιλειαν with A 56 *latt.*

This shows conclusively that A is in error in v. 9 omitting ημας, and in error v. 10 omitting τω θεω ημων. Now βασιλειαν is the common base of A 56 *copt*, while A's omissions find no countenance in *copt*.

v. 12. *Copt* substitutes *kingdom* for *riches* and omits *και ισχυν*. No Greeks.

13. *Copt* omits *και υποκατω της γης* [not *sah*] with ℵ 12 14 22[txt] 33 47 59 61 67 69 92 95 119*.

Conclusive for an old polyglot base is *εν τη θαλασση* of *copt* with only ℵ and *syr* and *latt*, while *all other Greeks* have *επι* (but 114 = *υπο*).

(*Sah* retaining 'and under the earth' merely adds ⲁⲩⲱ ⲑⲁⲗⲁⲥⲥⲁ, reading 'and under the earth and sea,' turning the difficulty and somewhat supporting 114 above.)

Same verse. *Copt* omits *και τω αρνιω*, but no Greeks apparently, nor does *sah*.

14. *Copt* = apparently *λεγουσιν το αμην*. No Greeks give *λεγουσιν*, but the *το αμην* is plain in *copt* ⲭⲉ ⲁⲙⲏⲛ, as *sah* ⲭⲉ ϩⲁⲙⲏⲛ.

vi. 1. *Copt* introduces this chapter with + *μετα ταυτα* [not *sah*]. *Copt* has ϩⲟⲧⲉ, *sah* omits the preposition (with Greek 81).

*Copt* does *not* add *επτα* with most, but omits *και* before *ηκουσα* with 7–16–39–45–69–104 (see this group and copt above at v. 8 in a matter involving retranslation; therefore the "intervention of a version," as Chase calls such things, can be decided upon with some probability here as to *which* version). Note, however, that this very thing draws *Lat* and *Copt* very close.

2 *fin.* ℵ is quite alone with both *copt* and *sah*, writing *νικων και ενικησεν* for *νικων και ινα νικηση*. This seems quite conclusive about ℵ and Egypt, when we find *both* Versions agree exactly in a special turn of phrase. Notice that Latin is quite definite (with the Greek) 'vincens ut vinceret,' while *syr* S and 32 36 conflate the readings.

*syr* S = *νικων και ενικησε και ινα νικηση* } as *sah* (*Bal.*). Not *Goussen.*
32 36 (both connected with *syr* and *copt*) } (*Prim* "ut vinceret et
= *νικων και ινα νικηση και ενικησε* } victor exiit").

vi. 4. As between *copt* and *sah*, note *sah* goes with the plurality here *init.* "*και εξηλθεν*," while *copt* says *και ειδον. εξηλθεν*, which ℵ further amplifies to *και ειδον και ιδον* (*sic*) *εξηλθεν*, and 34–35–68–87 with 119–123 say *και ειδον και ιδου εξηλθεν.*

Same verse. *Copt* omits αλλος with *syr* S [not Greek] but substitutes thus: "a horse of colour of fire *all over* (ⲧⲏⲣⲫ)."

Same verse. $-$ αυτω (*post* εδοθη) by ℵ$^{a}$A 31 *gig Prim Anonym* is supported by *copt* which brings ⲫⲏ very early in the verse; *cf. sah.*

Same verse *fin.* The order μεγαλη μαχαιρα by A alone (for μαχαιρα μεγαλη) is *coptic* and *sah* order against all Greeks and Latins.

vi. 5. Here Horner's English text has a mistake or misprint: ⲁⲓⲥⲱⲧⲉⲙ *I saw* instead of *I heard.* All Greeks ηκουσα. So also *sah.*

*N.B.*—To show the somewhat eclectic text of ℵ note that in all these verses although *copt* (with ACP) omits και βλεπε in the phrases ερχου και βλεπε, ℵ retains.

6. *Copt* [not *sah*] reads "a harsh voice" ⲉⲟⲩⲥⲙⲏ ⲉⲥⲡⲁϣⲧ. No other support.

And again before λεγουσαν *copt* adds alone 'as a voice of an eagle' [not *sah*, nor others].

All Horner's MSS. seem to read thus. He mentions *aeth* as to this addition, as in some other like cases, but it seems strange to think *copt* could have got this from *aeth*, since *all* Horner's coptic read thus, so that *aeth* must have got it from *copt.*

Same verse. *Copt* (and *sah*) read δε for και *sec.*, thus ⲡⲓⲛⲉϩ ⲁⲉ ⲛⲉⲙ ⲡⲓⲏⲣⲡ. No Greeks, but 35 (of the Egyptian group 34–35–68–87) omits this και.

7. φωνην is omitted by *copt* as by *gig* [see remarks above on vi. 1] and also CBP and numberless cursives. I judge rightly here against ℵ and *syr* and *sah.*

8. $-$ εν (ante λιμω) of ℵ 98 only (and 57 by mistake against Colinaeus) may be a reflection of coptic. But although ℵ (and others) repeat the omission before θανατω, *copt* has quite a different word from death, and writes ⲛⲉⲙ ⲡⲓϩⲟⲕϩⲉⲭ = *cum afflictione*, although *sah* holds ⲛⲉⲙ ⲡⲙⲟⲩ = συν (or και) θανατω.

Same verse. Note that *gig* omits υπο before των θηριων = "et bestiis terrae" = *copt* and *sah* ⲛⲉⲙ ⲛⲓⲑⲏⲣⲓⲟⲛ. Surely all these things tie up *coptic sah syr* ℵ and *gig* to an old polyglot base.

9. Order of copt την σφραγιδα την πεμπτην is here agreed

to by 14–92 and 59 with *syr* S, and practically by ℵ* who omits ε̄ by mistake.

+ των ανθρωπων of ℵP 1 *etc.* [not the group 34–35–68–87] is supported by *copt.*

— δια *sec.* by A, and *gig tol Cypr Prim* only, is supported by *copt* [not *sah*] with ⲛⲉⲙ for και (— δια).

vi. 10. After quite a long time we get (evidently a basic) agreement between 35 [*non* 34] and 87, with only 44 besides in writing with *copt* ο αγιος ο αληθινος (— και the copula between the two attributes).

11. ετι χρονον μικρον of the Greek is completely agreed to by *copt* (and *sah*), not conforming to *syr* S, nor countenancing the επι (for ετι) of ℵ (which must be an error [compare however εως of *syr* S]), while μικρον, omitted by B and so many cursives, is distinctly present in *sah-boh*, while omitted among the cursives by 34–35–87 (*hiat* 68).

Same verse. '*qui occidentur*' of *gig* for οι μελλοντες αποκτεινεσθαι of Greek, agrees more closely with *coptic*; while the addition of υπο αυτων here by ℵ* is not countenanced by *coptic.*

12. + ολη (POST σεληνη) with ℵCAB *etc.* is agreed to by *copt.* The coptic however frequently supplements the narrative with ⲧⲏⲣϥ alone, where the Greek and Syriac do not admit the word.† *Sahidic* frequently disagrees in those places, as it does here, omitting ολη altogether. Some cursives put ολη (*before* σεληνη), viz. 7 8 14 19 **28** 29 31 93 94 95 97 98. This is merely a later development, although it includes 28. It is noteworthy that 34–35–87 (*hiat* 68) agree with *sah* and a good many cursives in *omitting* ολη. This is a good test place for the *influence* of *copt.* It is very doubtful if ολη belongs in the narrative notwithstanding additional support of *gig* and *syr* S.

Same verse. — ως *sec. copt* and *sah* is agreed to by *gig* and by no Greeks, although εις for ως is substituted by 4 29 45 64 98 and 109$^{gr}$ (while 109$^{arm}$ omits with *gig* and *sah copt*); "sanguinea" *Novat Auct de prom Victorin.*

13. et stellae ceciderunt de caelo *pro* και οι αστερες του ουρανου

† Sometimes *syr* S does, as vi. 14 + πασα *ante* ιησους, *syr* S and *copt* alone.

επεσαν of *gig* is supported by *copt*, and this is rather an important point of order. No Greeks agree. This is interesting as to ℵ, for ℵ follows immediately with επι for εις (ϵχϵϩ of *copt*) with 22 23 **47** 55** **56** 81 102 and *syr* S *latt*. Now ℵ must have been copying a polyglot or he would have shown us και οι αστερες επεσαν απο του ουρανου επι if looking simply at coptic, whereas he holds the Greek order, but then prefers επι. As επι is supported by 47 and 56 also this επι is probably basic *graeco*-copt.

As bearing on a *graeco-copt* under the eye of A, note that A writes θεου for ουρανου alone.

Same verse. The coptic order of clause βαλλει τους ολυνθους αυτης υπο μεγαλου ανεμου σειομενη does not appear to find other support, but compare the απο for υπο of ℵ* 14–92 31** *syr* S and Σ.

vi. 14. The construction of *copt* differs. απεχωρισθη is eliminated (*syr* S and *sah* had a little difficulty here) and the rolling up of the document is given prominence. For the whole clause και ουρανος απεχωρισθη ως βιβλιον ειλισσομενον, *copt* says *et caelum revolutum est sicut librum*, while *gig* retains *discessit* but says *sicut liber involutus*.

Same verse. + πασα (*ante* νησος) only *syr* S and *copt* (*cf.* insulae *vg latt*).

See – αυτων ℵ 26 31 107 and compare *copt*.

απεκεινησαν A and compare *copt*.

15. *Copt* says '*with all the freemen*' for και πας ελευθερος which ℵ* omits. ℵ* is wrong. *Copt* turns the end. For και εις τας πετρας των ορεων *copt* says '*and the holes of the rocks*' (*cf.* 107* περας for πετρας; *cf. latt*: "in petris"), while some coptic MSS. say "*and the holes of the* EARTH."

16. *Copt* changes the order to ταις πετραις και τοις ορεσι without apparent support.

The group 34–35–87 (*hiat* 68) omit και *ult.* before απο της οργης. *Copt* does not omit, but coptic's *form* of ⲛⲉⲓ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ may have given rise to this. Note *sah* has plainly ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ.

17. Coptic order ηλθεν η μεγαλη ημερα της οργης αυτου is witnessed to only by cursive 114.

As regards της οργης αυτου, for which ℵC 18 38 *syr* S and Σ *gig*, an important group, witness to της οργης αυτων, *copt* seems plain for αυτου, thus *copt*: ⲛ̄ⲧⲉ ⲡⲉⲕϫⲱⲛⲧ, and *sah*: ⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲩⲟⲣⲅⲏ.

"To stand before him." *Copt* amplifies unjustifiably. *Sah* is even briefer than the Greek.

vii. 1. While *sah* omits και *init.* with *latt* and the greek uncials CA only, *copt* writes ⲙⲙⲉⲛⲉⲛⲥⲁ ⲛⲁⲓ ⲁⲉ.

— της γης *sec. copt* and also *syr* S with the cursives 38 62/3 72 80, this family generally running with *syr* rather than *copt.* Not omitted by 34–35–87 (*hiat* 68).

*Copt* (all MSS. apparently) adds μητε επι τους ποταμους (*post* θαλασσης) but not *sah* nor any Greeks.

2. The treatment of this verse is essentially after the coptic manner. Compare the verse throughout.

3. και *pro* μητε *prim.* A 38 106 *vg.* *Cf. copt* and *sah* ⲛⲉⲙⲙ. Same verse. — ημων 28 47 61 90 95 *syr* S is also omitted by *coptic.*

4. *Copt* adds επι το μετωπον αυτων after εσφραγισμενων without Greek support.

5/8. εσφραγ. is missing everywhere except in the last place in *copt,* thus agreeing apparently alone with *syr* S.

5/8. *Copt* transfers ασηρ from verse 5 to verse 8 after ζαβουλων.

6. ⲁⲁⲛ is substituted by *copt* for μανασση. Not so Greeks (but see verse 5 ⲁⲁⲛ *pro* Γαδ a few), while 30 39 69* 91 98 omit.

9. *Copt,* with *syr* S [not *sah*], adds και *init.*

— και ιδου *copt sah* and *syr* S with Greek A only and *latt* and *Cypr bis Prim.*

*ibid.* επι for ενωπιον *prim.* of A very likely comes from the coptic column of this MS. from misreading ⲙ̄ⲙⲉⲙⲙⲟ ⲙ̄ⲡⲓⲑⲣⲟⲛⲟⲥ.

11. The order of *copt* 'upon their face before the throne' does not appear in the Greek MSS.

12. *Copt* omits και η ισχυς (or και η δυναμις), writing only ⲛⲉⲙⲙ ϯϫⲟⲙⲙ, but *sah* preserves the double expression.

13. οτι (pro ουτοι) 29–30–98. *Cf. copt* ϫⲉ ⲛⲓⲙⲙ where it takes the form of a question at the opening; so also in *sah,* omitting τινες εισι later. Not so the Greeks.

14. — και *init. copt* and *sah,* perhaps, as is often the case with

them, for a graphic touch ; perhaps from confusion of ⲭⲉ following, with ⲗⲉ ;

*Copt* introduces the clause "My Lord" with ⲭⲉ, as also the next (alone), and the third : "these are they" where 29 of the Greeks supports with ὁτι.

Same verse. For ελευκαναν *copt* glosses "made them glorious." Not so *sah* = sanctified, purified, or merely *mundaverunt*.

vii. 15. The differing coptic order 'and they serve him in his temple in the day as well as in the night' is not supported by any Greeks.

16. ℵ (and 53 103) comes in here with *copt* omitting ετι *prim.* with *vg Cypr Fulg* and in such a way that it is clearly not an accident, but basic Coptic or Latin agreement. Omit twice *syr* S and 36 *syr* (*not sah*).

*Copt* adds "neither shall they toil" after διψησουσιν, and substitutes *shadow* for ο ηλιος, omitting the article with 38 59 73–80. This is rather curious on the part of these cursives, who do not alter ηλιος, while *copt* writes distinctly ϩⲛⲓⲃⲓ against *sah* ⲡⲣⲏ.

viii. 1. For ὡς ἡμιωριον *copt* has ϣⲁ ⲟⲩⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩ "*up to* (*usque ad*) an hour," but *sah* ⲛⲁⲟⲩⲥⲓⲥ ⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩ.

3. For ινα δωση (or ινα δωσει) 81 writes ινα δωσει αὐτα which agrees with *copt*, but *copt* follows with ⲛ̄ⲥⲁ ("*cum*" or "besides" before ταις προσευχαις) while *sah* is more definite with ⲛ̄ⲥⲁ.

4. Here 100 agrees with *copt*, adding παντων after αγιων.

5. *Copt* adds ⲛ̄ⲛⲟⲩⲃ after τον λιβανωτον, but no Greek MSS. so far recorded.

7. *Copt* has the additional clause και το τριτον της γης κατεκαη, but (using ⲛⲉⲥⲁ as the conjunction) elides the verb after δενδρων with 16. *Sah* acts differently (*q.v.*).

8. Here my whole Egyptian group 34–35–68–87 adds μερος *post* τριτον with the *coptic* ϥⲣⲉ̄, and *sah* ⲡⲟⲩⲛ̄ and *latt* pars.

9. In this next verse the same *latin sah* and *coptic* expression is observed in 34–35–68–87 and *also* in **36** and our friend ℵ + μερος, while *syr* S and Σ add παντων with *copt*.

This double conjunction is decidedly interesting as a

combination. While it is to be observed that the ϕρεϯ and ⲡⲟⲩⲛ *secundo loco* in this verse and of Latins is *not* shared by the Greeks.

On the other hand another sympathetic point occurs. The Greek runs τα εχοντα ψυχας, but the *coptic*: "those in which there was soul of life," the "soul" being (both in *sah* and *copt*) a transliteration of the Greek and written ⲯⲩⲭⲏ. Observe then that ℵ with 46–88–101 gives ψυχην for ψυχας, = also *syr* S.

viii. 10. Note here again + μερος 36. *copt latt.*

*fin.* υδατος *copt* and *sah* without Greek following.

11. Notice that ℵ does not write υδατος in previous verse, yet in this verse 11 for all Greeks αψινθος or ὁ αψινθος, ℵ* *alone* agrees with the coptic form αψινθιον (*copt*: ⲁⲯⲓⲛⲑⲓⲟⲛ, *sah* ⲁⲡⲥⲓⲛⲑⲓⲟⲛ). This to my mind is specially noteworthy for it seems to be sympathy of *eye* as much as anything, for no Greeks nor ℵ follow with 'bitter as an alloe' (ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲁⲗⲗⲟⲏ) as do all the coptic MSS. for αψινθον or αψινθιον of the Greeks *secundo loco.*

Notice however that *h* (with *Prim*) has "*quasi* absentium" for "*in* absinthium" and εις αψ. of all Greeks (but 81, which writes ως αψινθος), while *copt* writes ⲙ̄ⲙⲫⲣⲏϯ ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲁⲗⲗⲟⲏ. (*Prim* sicut absen.)

12. μερος seems to be absent from all Greeks in this verse; As to και εσκοτισθη for ινα σκοτισθη of 34–35–68–87 see *copt*: "that they might become dark *and that* their third part might not shine" . . . *Cf. aeth.*

ϩⲉⲛ ⲡⲓⲉϩⲟⲟⲩ ⲛⲉⲙ ⲡⲓⲉⲭⲱⲣϩ appears to find no counterpart in Greek.

13. ℵ alone of Greeks omits ἑνος; so both *copt* and *sah*, the one writing ⲉⲟⲩⲁϩⲱⲙ, the other ⲉⲩⲁⲉⲧⲟⲥ.

πετωμενου is omitted by *copt*, while it adds "crying out," retaining "saying," thus: "crying out in a great voice saying"; apparently no Greek support for this.

*Copt* does not add τρις before ουαι ουαι ουαι, but prefixes the usual coptic introductory ⲭⲉ.

ix. 1. P goes here with *copt* ϩⲓⲭⲉⲛ or ⲉⲭⲉⲛ writing επι την γην. So 38 επι της γης.

2. *Copt* omits και ηνοιξε το φρεαρ της αβυσσου with ℵB *etc.* while one coptic MS. "B" omits εκ του φρεατος ως καπνος

following with 1 9 27 **35** 41 57 75 **87**, which includes two out of four of our Egyptian group (in bold type).

ix. 5. A few Greeks (23 102** 104) add αυτους after βασανθ. So does *copt.*

σκορπιων seems to be read by 37*. So *copt.*

For ὁταν *copt* writes ϵϣωπ. Only 21–28–73–79–103 vary ὁταν, writing ὡς ὁταν.

The point made by 23 above [without 55] of + αυτους in sympathy with *copt*, is now made clear by 23–55* *txt* writing δακη for παισιη. *Cf. copt* ⲁⲩϣⲁⲡⲭⲉⲕϩ, also *sah.*

6. It is noticeable that 23–55 add αυτων after θανατον, but not *sah copt.* Possibly the Middle Egyptian version did this.

7. το ομοιωμα of *syr* S = *copt* here.

*ibid.* "being of color of gold" does not agree with others.

8. *Copt* reverses the order of "their teeth . . lions," and "their hair . . women," but not others.

9. *Copt* substitutes "wings" for θωρακας *primo loco*; not *sah* nor others.

*ibid.* Horner translates ϯⲥⲱⲙ "sound," as *h* 'sonus' for 'vox' and 'φωνη,' but it is equally or better the equivalent of φωνη and *vox*; while *sah* actually *does* have 'sound' or 'clamor' (ⲡⲉϩⲣⲟⲟⲩ).

*ibid.* *Copt* omits πολλων without Greek authority.

10. *Copt* and *sah* "and *there are* tails to them" = semitic; *cf. h*; coptic cannot directly express the verb ϵχω.

11. Cursive 81 (and *Compl*) alone go with *copt* ὁ ἀπολλυων. *Copt* = ⲭⲉ ⲫⲏ ⲉⲧⲧⲁⲕⲟ and *sah* = ⲗⲉ ⲭⲉ ⲡⲉⲧⲧⲁⲕⲟ.

12. ϵρχϵται (for ϵρχονται) of ℵ*A *etc.* = *copt.*

— ϵτι *copt* with the 1 *fam etc.*

12/13. In this matter of punctuation apparently *copt* and *sah* agree with a good many cursives in joining μϵτα ταυτα to ver. 13, and they omit και (13 *init.*) with ℵ 56 and *syr* S, a noteworthy little group.

13. — τϵσσαρων A 18 (21–28–73–79–103) some latins and so *copt* (while ℵ omits μιαν ϵκ των τϵσσαρων κϵρατων). ℵ$^{a}$ in supplying the clause omits τϵσσαρων.

*ibid.* *Coptic* adds του θρονου before του θϵου. No Greeks nor *sah.*

(ante oculos *vg etc*, sub oculis *Prim, pro* in conspectu *al.*).

ix. 14/15. *All* Horner's Bohairic MSS. omit (14) τους δεδεμενους επι τω ποταμω τω μεγαλω Ευφρατη. (15) και ελυθησαν οι τεσσαρες αγγελοι. This is an error of homoioteleuton from αγγελους . . . αγγελοι where in the coptic both terminations ⲁⲅⲅⲉⲗⲟⲥ would be similar. But it is not omitted in the sahidic (Goussen's; passage not extant in Balestri) nor in any Greeks.

Some pretty arguments could be based here as to *sah* and *boh* if any Greeks omitted, but they do not, only ℵ 41 51–90 98 and 100 omitting οἱ before ἡτοιμασμενοι in verse 15.

15. ℵ 1 omit και ημεραν with *Compl*! Not so *copt*, but *copt* says "*the* day" with 10–21–37–49–77–91–96–110, 28–73–79–103 38, which grouping does *not* however include our "Egyptian" codices 34–35–68–87.

*ibid.* Likewise + μερος (*copt vg*) found in 21–28 37 73–79–80–103 *gig* is not observed here in 34–35–68–87.

16/17. *Copt* says 'I heard their number thus. And I saw" . . . Apparently no Greeks, although 38 omits ουτως in ver. 16.

17. ϩιχωοϥ. Compare ℵ επανω *pro* επ'. [See xx. 11.]

*ibid.* *Copt* says ⲗⲉ for και *sext.* but no Greeks (*om. gr* 4 *et Anonym*).

18 *init.* και απο (*pro* ὑπο) 18 *syr* S and *vg copt* (ⲟⲩⲟϩ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ) but not *sah* = only ⲉⲃⲟⲗ.

*ibid.* + μερος of *copt latt* does not occur here among the Greeks.

*ibid.* — εκ *sec.* and *tert.* is implied by *copt*, which uses ⲛⲉⲙⲙ.

*ibid.* As to των εκπορευομενων of 21–28 38 80–103 119–123 *vg*; *cf. copt* ⲛⲏ.

19 *fin.* *Copt* "and in this they were hurting the men five months." This addition of "the men five months" appears unauthorised elsewhere.

20. — οἱ *sec.* by *copt* = 67 and 119 (*supra lin. insert.*) also *gig* of Latins only.

*ibid.* και τα ξυλινα και τα λιθινα This order of ℵ 119–123 *syr* S alone, is the order of *copt*, but not *sah*.

Such places prove pretty conclusively, with what went before in earlier chapters, that ℵ was handling the *bohairic* and not *sah*.

21. While *sah* omits ουτε εκ των κλεμματων αυτων with *syr* S

and *Prim, copt* holds it : ⲟⲩⲗⲉ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲉⲛ ⲛⲟⲩⲥⲑⲟⲩⲓ, and inserts before it ⲛⲉⲓⲓ ⲛⲟⲩⲥⲱⲟⲩ (*'cum abominationibus eorum'*) without other authority.

x. 1. νεφελη (*pro* νεφελην) of 21 only. *Cf. lat* nube, and *copt.*

*ibid.* ℵ* writes η θριξ for ιρις [ℵ$^{a}$ corrects to ιρις without the article]. Whence this? It is again a possible mental process from the coptic column ϯⲓⲣⲓⲥ.

2. — ανεωγμενον A alone of Greeks. Horner's bohairic text omits this with part of his MSS. Who shall say that A$^{gr}$ is not Egyptian in the light of this, and who can possibly controvert an Egyptian copy for both ℵ and A in the light of the foregoing facts?

[*sah* of Goussen is wanting from middle of verse 1 to verse 4, and also Balestri.]

The point is that these sympathizing Greek MSS. never reproduce a thing like ⲁⲫⲱϥ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ in the next verse, for that could plainly be avoided by the *eye.*

3. Horner translates ⲉϥϩⲉⲙϩⲉⲙ "roaring." The Greek curs. 19 writes μυκομενος with *Prim* 'rugiens'; *gig* has 'sicut leo *m*ugit' (*Karlsson; Belsheim* prints '*r*ugit').

*ibid.* For ελαλησαν *copt* says 'gave their voice': ⲁⲩϯ ⲛ̄ⲧⲟⲩⲥⲙⲏ. This is to be noted as regards ℵ* because ℵ writes φωναι for βρονται, again as it were from an *error oculi.*

Quite a different expression for ελαλησαν in the next verse 4 is used by *copt.*

4. The coptic here is quite different and evidently basic. It says "And I heard the things which the seven thunders said; I was about to write them also; and I heard a voice . . ." There is therefore no confusion at the beginning from the second 'I heard.' Observe that for οτε ℵ 37 73–79–80–103 have οσα with *Prim* and *gig* which approaches more nearly the coptic, but *copt* alone says 'I heard.'

*ibid.* *Copt* says "I was about to write them *also.*" *Cf.* 41. 102 + και *ante* εμελλον.

*ibid.* The order of the clause σφραγισον α . . γραψης is quite different in *coptic.* Note that the ὅσα for ἃ of ℵ 18 finds an exact counterpart in coptic ⲛⲏ.

5. *Copt* ⲉⲡⲱⲱⲓ ⲉⲧⲫⲉ for "εις" τον ουρανον is a fine and

strong expression conveying 'up to.' The only change by Greeks is επι for εις by 14–92. Had ℵ been *wilfully* accommodating, such a place as this would not have escaped him.

x. 6. — εν *ante* τω ζωντι ℵB *etc.* *Cf. copt* ⲛ̅ⲛ̅ and *lat* 'per viventem.'

*ibid.* *Copt* elides και τα εν αυτω with 21–28 62/3–72 73–79–80 –103; also και τα εν αυτη *prim.* with 102, and adds παντα in the last clause after θαλασσαν, alone.

7. — αλλα *init. copt* [*non sah*] with *gig* only as it appears.

*ibid.* For οταν μελλη σαλπιζειν, και τελεσθη το μυστηριον του θεου *copt* says "when he shall sound. For (ⲅⲁⲣ) the mystery of God was completed . . ." No others apparently.

8. — παλιν *copt.* No others.

— και *ante* λεγουσα *copt* with 28.

9. και ειπον (*pro* λεγων) 59 and *cf. copt.*

*ibid.* — καταφαγε *copt.* Apparently no others. But *copt* says 'Take it *to thee*' for 'Take and eat *it.*' B 7 29 39 67 69 have αυτω, but perhaps only an itacism.

*ibid.* For αλλ' *copt* says ⲟⲩⲟϩ. No others. If ℵ had been wilfully accommodating he would not write ΑΛΛΑ as he does.

10. For και κατεφαγον αυτο. και ην εν τω στοματι μου ως μελι γλυκυ και οτε εφαγον αυτο *copt* says: 'and it was sweet in my mouth as honey and having eaten it.' Not so others. But 34–35–87 omit οτε εφαγεν αυτο, while retaining και κατεφαγον αυτο above, which *copt* omits there. This is curious.

*ibid.* εγεμισθη *pro* επικρανθη of ℵ does not appear to find any counterpart in our coptic MSS. (most write ⲧⲁⲛⲉⲭⲓ ⲉⲣⲱⲁϥⲓ while two MSS. say ⲱⲟⲡⲓ ⲉⲥⲟⲓ ⲛ̅ⲱⲁϥⲓ), but compare *sahidic* of Goussen ⲁⲉ ⲁϥⲥⲓⲱⲉ ⲛ̅ⲑⲓϩⲏⲧ.

(*gig:* repletus est venter meus amaritudine; *Prim* repletus est venter meus [*absque* amaritudine]).

11. λεγουσιν *pro* λεγει of *copt* [*non sah*]. Not Latin except *Harl am** = ℵAB *etc.*

*ibid.* For παλιν *copt* has "*also.*" No others, but 21 73.

79 103 add και before προφητευσαι, retaining παλιν.

xi. 1. *Copt* says "a reed *of gold*," as *aeth.*

For ομοιος *copt* says ⲉϥⲟⲓ "being," and some MSS. ⲉϥⲟⲛⲓ "being like." See 38 which alone says ως ραβδος for ομοιος ραβδω.

+ μοι (*post* λεγων). *Copt* is only witnessed for by 119–123 *vg dem lips.*

— και (*ante* μετρησον) of *copt* = 7–45–104.

xi. 2. — και *sec.* *copt*, but not by Greeks.

ⲉⲩⲉϩⲱⲱⲙ ⲛ̄ϩⲏⲧⲥ for πατησουσιν conveys the French "fouler par leur pieds," *i.e.* they shall trample in it, and also the French *parmi*. No other support. A alone erroneously μετρησουσιν.

3. — και *sec.* *copt*. Not Greek (*Cf. syr* S).

4. — της γης *copt* and 12 only.

5. "And that which they wish they shall do," *copt* ( — αδικησαι). No Greek support. Only 50 varies, substituting δοκιμασαι.

οστις (*pro* ει τις) 38 80 *copt* ⲫⲏ and *syr* S.

αποκτειναι (*pro* αδικησαι *sec.*) 21–28 36 37 73–79–80–103. Not *copt* nor *sah*, which however use different words.

6 *init.* *Sah* agrees with Greek ούτοι, writing ⲛⲁⲓ, while *copt* substitutes ⲭⲉ, and *syr* S introduces the verse with και.

*ibid.* Horner renders "to cause them to turn and become blood." *Cf.* the *convertendi* of *lat* for στρεφειν.

7. For οταν *copt* substitutes ⲉⲱⲱⲡ (*sah* ⲉⲩⲱⲁⲛ), stopping at μαρτυριαν αυτων (continuing ⲡⲓⲑⲏⲣⲓⲟⲛ ⲁ̄ⲉ̄). Only 1 12 57 62–3 72 80 81 119–123 write οτε, while *gig* says *postquam* against *Prim* and the usual latin *cum*.

8. *Copt* and *sah* insert a verb "shall be" before επι της πλατειας. So do 21–28–37 73–79–80–103 (εασει), with ℵ$^{c}$ εσται, and latt *jacebunt* (*Prim:* "ponet," *cf. Prim Tichon* and *Anon. ad loc.*).

*Sah* = ⲥⲟⲗⲟⲙⲁ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲕⲏⲙⲉ, but *boh* ⲥⲟⲗⲟⲙⲁ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉ ϫⲏⲙⲓ.

— και *ult.* by the 1 group *etc.* and *syr* S is omitted by *copt*, but not by *sah*, which has ⲟⲛ.

Both *copt* and *sah* have "*their* Lord," αυτων for ημων. ℵ* 23 alone omit ημων. It is always wonderful to see how deeply ℵ* was considering as he wrote, without rising

from his seat apparently. This place, like others, bothered him. He refused to follow his *Latin, Copt,* or *Syriac* here.

xi. 9. Horner translates *copt* ⲉⲩⲉⲛⲁⲩ "they shall see," but ℵCABP *etc.* all βλεπουσιν.

*Sah* (= *greek*) ⲥⲉⲛⲁⲩ 'they see.'

*Copt* inserts "their body" after "see" alone, retaining bodies twice later in the verse.

των φυλων και λαων ℵ *syr* S (*cf.* 23) agrees with *coptic* order [*non sah*] and *vg*, but not other Latins.

10. Horner gives these verbs in the future. Against present of ℵCP *etc.* (see D*[copt]) (*sah* has the weak future).

*Copt* adds 'saying' before οτι.

11. *Copt* and *sah* say "*and* a spirit of God" for πνευμα ζωης εκ του θεου. Exceptionally 21 73 substitute και for εκ here.

For επ αυτους *copt* says ⲉϧⲟⲩⲛ ⲉⲣⲱⲟⲩ (so also *sah*). *Cf.* only A 18 21–28** 36 59 73–79–80–81** 95 100–103 114 (*syr* S conflates with both) with εν αυτοις, and ℵ *etc.* (incl. 34–35–87, *hiat* 68) εις αυτους.

12. ηκουσα *copt* and *sah* for ηκουσαν. So ℵ[a or c] B 1 *etc.* including 21 28 *etc.* and 34–35–87 *Anonym gig.*

— τη ante νεφελη 21–28–73–79–80–103 *Cf. copt.*

13. *Copt* (apparently *all* Horner's codices) says "the *third* part" for το δεκατον. Not so ℵ and the rest, but curiously enough B here. No others add μερος here.

εδοξαν *pro* εδωκαν δοξαν of 44 106 (although I believe errors) may be compared to *copt.*

14. For the παρηλθεν of ℵ 21–28–73–79–80–103 (instead of απηλθεν) compare *copt* ⲁϥⲥⲓⲛⲓ.

και (*pro* ιδου) 104. *Cf. copt.* (Et ecce *vg am Prim* [*non gig harl*]).

15. *Coptic* says ⲁⲩⲭⲱⲡⲓ . . ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϧⲉⲛ ⲧⲫⲉ "happened *out of* Heaven" for "εγενοντο . . εν τω ουρ." and "factae sunt in." No Greeks or Latins appear to follow this. And *sah* has ϩⲣⲁⲓ ϩⲛ̄ = rather ἐν than ἐκ.

*ibid.* του κυριου του θεου ημων *copt* followed by ⲛⲉⲱ ⲡⲉϥⲭ$\overline{\text{ⲣⲥ}}$. No others seem to say 'the Lord our God,' but 38 and *syr* S substitute θεου for κυριου.

*fin.* + αμην by ℵ 12 18 38 40 is supported by *some* coptic

MSS. Note presence of ℵ 18 and 38 and *latt* in this connection.

xi. 16. Immediately following, *copt* omits οἱ *prim.*, with ℵ* A 72, before εικοσι (και) τεσσαρες, writing ⲟⲩⲟⲩ ϛ̅ⲕ̅ⲁ̅.

This should be noted as to ℵA and *copt*, for this whole matter of eye, ear and mind of ℵ while copying (evidently a graeco-coptic MS.) will bear the most careful watching; for note, immediately following again, ℵ has + και (alone with 95) *post* θρονους αυτων. Not so *copt*. *But* the *coptic* for επεσαν is ⲁⲩϩⲓⲧⲟⲩ, the first four letters being easily confused for ⲟⲩⲟⲩ = και. This is quite instructive.

In the same verse *coptic* omits και *fin.* before προσεκυνησαν (as often in such descriptions) and is followed by one of the Egyptian group 87.

17. Again ℵ (alone) has κ̅ς̅ ο θ̅ς̅ for κυριε ο θεος of all others. Compare *copt* ⲡⲟ̅ⲥ̅ where the sigma would mislead the eye of ℵ.

ℵ (alone) omits ὁ before παντοκρατωρ. Not so *copt*, but the article ⲡⲓ hardly shows to a rapid glance of the eye ⲡⲓⲡⲁⲛⲧⲟⲕⲣⲁⲧⲱⲣ, while *sah* (*Goussen*) writes ⲡ'ⲡⲁⲛⲧⲱⲕⲣⲁⲧⲱⲣ.

*ibid.* On the other hand και ο ερχομενος omitted by ℵ[a]ABP and many, is found in *coptic* ⲟⲩⲟϩ ϫⲛⲏⲟⲩ. What does ℵ* do? A most curious thing. ℵ* (with C *ut vid.*) omits only ο ερχομενος retaining the και, thus:

κ̅ς̅ ο θ̅ς̅ παντοκρα
τωρ ο ων και ο ην
και οτι ειληφας τ̅η̅

Now for this οτι in Greek, *coptic* writes ϫⲉ. Hence ϫⲉ could be mistaken for the copula ⲁⲉ or Greek και. An involuntary process by ℵ*. In fact one coptic MS. writes ⲟⲩⲟϩ ϫⲉ, which Horner calls attention to in connection with ℵ*C.

*ibid.* — την μεγαλην by *copt* [*non sah*] finds a counterpart in the eclectic but otherwise sympathetic 36.

18. *Copt* [*non sah*] says "*because* (ϫⲉ) thine anger came," ϫⲉ ⲁⲫⲓ ⲛ̅ϫⲉⲡⲉⲕϫⲱⲛⲧ (following with ⲛⲉⲙ for και *tert.*). No Greeks follow this.

*Copt* amplifies, writing "*cum tempore judicationis judi-*

*care mortuos.*" *Cf. h*: "*et tempus judicandorum mortuorum.*"

xi. 18. *Copt* says "and *all* that fear thy name." This is the usual coptic amplification. In such things ℵ does not follow.

*ibid.* *Syr* S now agrees with the coptic form of ⲛⲉⲗⲗ, writing τοις μικροις μετα των μεγαλων (*Cf.* also xix. 5 likewise). No Greeks.

*ibid.* — και (*ante* διαφθειραι) *copt* [*non sah*] as often in such a description. This is followed by A 21–73 only, and seems significant.

19. Here is evidence of polyglot handling. No Greeks add ὁ between ο ναος του θεου and εν τω ουρανω except CA 14–92, **34–35–87 38** 95 but the Latins *gig:* "quod in celo est," and *h Victorin* "quod est in caelo." Note the Greek group with the half-way Egypt-syr 14–92. Now coptic, *most* MSS., although Horner does not admit it into his text, write ⲉⲧϩⲉⲛ ⲧⲫⲉ instead of ϩⲉⲛ ⲧⲫⲉ.

*ibid.* As regards + ανω *post* ουρανω by ℵ* it might be caused by dittography, or from seeing and mentally repeating the coptic ⲟⲩⲟϩ which follows ⲧⲫⲉ.

*ibid.* The *order* βρονται και φωναι of *copt* is also witnessed to by 14–92 and the 34–35–87 group with 28 *etc.*, and *syr* S (which latter omits αυτου *sec.* with *copt*).

*ibid. fin.* For σεισμος 34–35–87 80 write σεισμοι. So *copt* definitely οι σεισμοι.

For και χαλαζα μεγαλη *copt* says "with stones of Heaven," the regular expression for hail. No change among Greeks.

xii. 1. + ειδον (*ante* σημειον) *Hippol.* Compare *copt* + ⲓⲥ (*ecce* or ιδου). No others add anything. In fact ⲓⲥ (voici, voici que [*Mallon, Gram. copt.*]) can be the equivalent of ιδου or ειδον. But *copt* is actually redundant with ⲓⲥ ϩⲛⲡⲡⲉ *copt codd plur* and text Horner, ABN reading ϩⲛⲡⲡⲉⲓⲥ and others ϩⲛⲡⲡⲉ without ⲓⲥ (as I understand the note).

*ibid.* *Copt* idiomatically supplies a verb: "being *given* upon her head." No others (*Cf. Victorin* "habens").

2. For κραζουσα of *syr* S *am* compare *copt.*

*ibid. fin.* *Copt* expresses "about to bring forth," future: ⲉⲥⲡⲁⲗⲗⲓⲥⲓ.

xii. 3. Compare coptic order and πυρρος or πυρος μεγας of ℵC *etc.*

*ibid.* — και *ult.* *Copt*, but no Greeks.

4. The latter part of this verse is slightly different in the coptic: "that if she should bring forth the son, the dragon might swallow *him.*" *Cf. fin.* + αυτο by 34–35–87 and 23 only.

Above, some coptic MSS. (and Horner's text) omit της μελλουσης τεκειν.

38 alone substitutes το παιδιον for το τεκνον. *Cf. copt.* and *sah* ⲡⲓϣⲏⲣⲓ.

5. This word is repeated here for υιον. *Coptic* says: ϯⲡⲓϣⲏⲣⲓ ⲛ̄ⲥⲱⲟⲩⲧ.

*ibid.* — παντα *copt* (which so often adds it). So only Greek 88 (against 46–101).

*ibid.* CP and the 1 fam. *etc.* omit εν. Not so *copt* which has ϩⲉⲛ.

*ibid.* — αυτης *copt*, with 21–28–73–79–103.

*ibid.* + προς (*ante* τον θρονον) ℵCABP and most; + εις *Hippol.* Compare the usual graphic *coptic:* ⲉⲡϣⲱⲓ ⲉⲁ ⲫ† (for προς τον θεον) ⲛⲉⲓ ⲉⲁ ⲡⲉⲫⲣⲟⲛⲟⲥ.

6. + αὐτῇ *post* ητοιμασμενον by 36 alone. Compare *copt.*

*ibid. fin. Copt codd plur* "*ninety*" and Horner text ϭ̄ ⲛ̄ⲑ̄ ⲛⲉⲥⲟⲟⲩ but *sah* (*Goussen*) ⲛ̄ϣⲉ ⲙⲛ̄ ⲥⲉ ⲛ̄ⲥⲟⲟⲩ (*sixty*). None of Horner's codices appear to read *sixty* (ⲝ̄ or ⲥⲉ), while the ⲉ in ⲥⲉ, or in ⲛⲉⲓ (for some *copt* read ⲛⲉⲓⲑ̄) may be responsible for the + πεντε of ℵ$^{c}$ greek. [*gig* reads *quadraginta !*]

7. + μεγας *ante* πολεμος *copt.* No Greeks, but so *vg* and *gigas*: "et factum est proelium MAGNUM."

*ibid.* — ὁ (ante *Μιχαηλ*) [of course with Latin] is only witnessed to by greek 13. This is rather curious among so many graeco-latin or latinizing greek codices as we have. Is it not significant perhaps of early *Latin* action *on* coptic instead of *vice versa*, so that above *magnum* of *gig* may have engendered ⲟⲩⲛⲓϣ† of *copt* instead of the other way about.

*ibid.* "πολεμησαι κατα" apparently *copt* for "επολεμησαν κατα" of *textus receptus.* Most have πολεμησαι μετα but 25–58–70–78–84–94 have πολεμησαι κατα with *copt*, and

so of the Latins *Victorin* and *Ambrosiaster* "adversus," while *gig* and the rest are content with "cum."

xii. 7. "and the dragon warred *against them*" of *copt* finds no amplification of επολεμησε among Greeks.

*ibid.* While 87 drops the final αυτου, both *copt* and *sah* have definitely ⲛⲉϥ.

8. ισχυσεν *copt* apparently, with A and many incl. 34–35–87.

*ibid.* Although above, verse 7, *copt* was alone in the phrase "warred *against* them," here in this verse ℵ (quite alone) adds something. *Copt* = "and he prevailed not *against them in fighting with them.*" ℵ retaining ισχυσαν must needs add προς αυτον instead of προς αυτους of *copt*, reading "and *they* prevailed not against *him*." Now if anything were lacking to prove our contention this appears to prove it. For ℵ retaining ισχυσαν yet let his eye wander to the coptic and add (*ex copt.*) προς αυτον instead of προς αυτους! No Latins add anything.

The various readings ισχυσαν or ισχυσεν merely refer to "the dragon and his angels" or "the dragon" himself. The verse goes on "nor was place found for *them* any more in the Heaven," that is for the dragon and his angels who had been fighting with Michael and his angels.

Some Greeks found trouble here following their ισχυσεν and substitute αυτω for αυτων with *copt*, but ℵ got himself into a terrible mix by his προς αυτον and therefore drops the αυτων altogether. That is ℵ*, for ℵ$^{c}$ adds αυτοις. This corrector had not struck out the προς αυτον above, nor have any correctors, they no doubt reading that the dragon and his angels had not prevailed (ισχυσαν) against Michael.

The one little letter ε or α in ισχυσεν or ισχυσαν might have caused more mischief if αγγελοι had not been mentioned as accompanying *both* champions, but ℵ is for excluding *both* hosts and *both* champions from Heaven; or rather, for ℵ* substitutes τοτε for τοπος, reading και ουκ ισχυσαν προς αυτον ουδε τοτε ευρεθη ετι εν τω ουρανω, he adds indefiniteness to the proceedings by saying that after *they* had not prevailed against *him*, *he*

was then no longer found in Heaven. A pretty muddle to get into from letting your eye wander to the coptic ⲟⲩⲃⲏⲟⲩ.

xii. 9. *Coptic* (with Greek 61 74 95 ὁ οφις ὁ μεγας) leaves ὁ δρακων without attribute and applies "*great*" to ὁ οφις.

ℵ seems to have looked at the coptic too, for he drops the article before οφις (with 1 12 57 81) writing ο δρακων ο μεγας οφις ο αρχαιος, so that one can read either :

ο δρακων ο μεγας, οφις ο αρχαιος, or

(with *copt*) ο δρακων, ο μεγας οφις ο αρχαιος.

I submit that all this absolutely proves that ℵ was using graeco-copt. If the reader is not yet persuaded, let him consider this. Following immediately in this place, ℵ [alone] drops the και following διαβολος, that is between διαβολος and ὁ σατανας. Now *boh* writes ⲡⲓⲇⲓⲁⲃⲟⲗⲟⲥ ⲡⲥⲁⲧⲁⲛⲁⲥ. What more proof is required, especially when we point out that *sahidic* does *not* drop και. *Sah* = ⲡⲇⲓⲁⲃⲟⲗⲟⲥ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲡⲥⲁⲧⲁⲛⲁⲥ, so it was from *boh* that ℵ followed with the omission.

*ibid.* For εις την γην *copt* gives ⲉⲡⲉⲥⲏⲧ ⲙ̄ⲡⲕⲁϩⲓ which Horner renders "*below* the earth." No Greeks vary, nor Latins. I think the coptic merely intends "*usque ad*," the French "en bas, jusqu'à la terre," as coptic does not amplify ⲉⲡⲉⲥⲏⲧ.

*Copt* uses this again as a complement for εβληθησαν.

*Copt* omits και *fin.* but no others.

10. εν τω ουρανω λεγουσαν, order of all uncials and most cursives, is also that of *copt.*

*ibid.* — αυτων *copt* is only supported by 32.

*ibid.* — ημων *tert.* by *copt* and about twenty cursives *Erasmus* 1 2 3 *Ald. Col.* and by *syr* S (*arm aeth*).

11. *Copt* begins this verse ⲭⲉ apparently all MSS. Not so *sah*, which has ⲁⲩⲱ (και) as all Greeks and Latins, except *Prim* (q.v.).

*ibid.* For αὐτοι ℵ alone substitutes οὗτοι (ipsi *latt*). *Cf.* the definite use of ⲛ̄ⲑⲱⲟⲩ by *copt* here. Horner's note here is : "ⲛ̄ⲑⲱⲟⲩ] cf. Gr. (*exc.* ℵ)." He intends, I suppose, to convey that ⲛ̄ⲑⲱⲟⲩ = αὐτοι, but I question very much whether the presence of ⲛ̄ⲑⲱⲟⲩ here did not influence ℵ to use οὗτοι instead of αὐτοι in his copy, as showing

emphasis in the coptic, which he borrowed thus (illegitimately).

xii. 11. For some time our friend 56 has been absent. He now takes the place of ℵ.

The coptic substitutes *blood* for λογον, writing blood twice, thus:

δια το αιμα του αρνιου και δια το αιμα (*pro* δια τον λογον) της μαρτυριας αυτων.

56 conflates thus:

δια το αιμα του αρνιου και δια τον λογον της μαρτυριας αυτων + και του αιματος αυτων.

*ibid.* For και ουκ *copt* has ⲭⲉ ⲟⲩⲏⲓ ⲅⲁⲣ. No Greek copies vary (but A with ουχ for ουκ).

*ibid.* *Copt* Horner text ⲧⲟⲩ ⲯⲩⲭⲏ "their life" and so *sah* (*Goussen*) ⲧⲉⲩ ⲯⲩⲭⲏ. But *Gr* 34–35–87 with 23 [*non* 55] say τας ψυχας for την ψυχην. Whence this unless from ⲛⲟⲩ ⲯⲩⲭⲏ of *copt*? Consulting Horner's note we find "ⲧⲟⲩ ⲯⲩⲭⲏ] ⲛⲟⲩ ⲯ., B *plur.*" He adds that an arabic note in A marks the *sahidic* for the *plural*, but the *coptic* for the singular. Perhaps other sahidic MSS. than the only one I am using here (*Goussen's* edition) may show the plural when Mr. Horner completes his edition of other *sah* MSS.

*ibid.* *Copt* is emphatic: ϣⲁⲉϥⲣⲏⲓ. The only change by Greeks is μεχρι (for αχρι) by 56 13–23 and 36 (all having shown coptic friendliness) and 16–69–102 22* 27 39 55. Here 55 accompanies its sisters 13 and 23, which it has opposed sometimes in their coptic leanings. [This group is the well-known one with δακη in ix. 5.]

12. The changed order by ℵ alone of

κατοικουντες εν αυτοις (for εν αυτοις σκηνουντες)

is exactly borne out both by *copt*: ⲉⲧϣⲟⲡ ⲛ̄ϩⲏⲧⲟⲩ

and by *sah*: ⲧⲟⲩⲛϩ ⲛ̄ϩⲏⲧⲟⲩ

although *copt* and *sah* use different verbs for *habitare*, ϣⲟⲡ and ⲟⲩⲛϩ respectively; κατοικουντες (*pro* σκηνουντες) without change of order is used by 26 29 30 31 61 62/3 72 80 81** 98 and 107.

*ibid.* + δε *post* ουαι by Apoc. 1 alone is supported by two coptic MSS. CZ.

*ibid.* — τοις κατοικουσι most Greeks with *copt* and *syr.*

xii. 12. ℵ slips in εις before *την γην* alone, whether as a substitute for coptic ⲙ̀ⲙⲟ before the direct complement or not it is impossible to say.

*ibid.* ℵ omits *μεγαν.* Both *copt* and *sah* have it, but place it before *θυμον* (*cf.* 119–123).

12/13. ⲕⲉ of *copt* and *sah* in the last clause of ver. 12 apparently finds no counterpart in Greek. *Gig vg* beginning ver. 13 with *Hippol.* write *postquam* (*Hipp.* *τοτε*) which may be the commentary on this ⲕⲉ (rendered by Horner "*only*").

13 *fin. Copt* expresses *τον αρρενα* by "the son male" in two words ⲙ̀ⲡⲓϣⲏⲣⲓ ⲛ̀ϩⲱⲟⲩⲧ. Note that 26–107 add *τον υιον* before *τον αρρενα.*

14. *Copt* says "great wings." Not so the Greeks. ℵ Greek omits *του* before *αετου,* but does not say "*as* those of an eagle" as *copt* does, which (*quasi*) is however witnessed to later by *Prim.*

*Copt* seems to have confused "*great* wings" of the woman with *great* as an attribute of eagle which it alone omits.

*ibid.* ℵ omits *καιρον* in error. Not so *copt* or *sah.*

15. The order of practically all Greeks *εκ του στοματος αυτου οπ. της γυν.* is agreed to by *copt* as to placing *εκ του στοματος* first, but *copt* further varies the order by placing *οπισω της γυναικος* last, thus: "and the serpent cast *from his mouth as a river of water behind the woman.*"

15/16. *Copt* omits *ινα ταυτην ποταμοφορητον ποιηση. και εβοηθησεν η γη τη γυναικι.*

*Cf.* a longer omission *ut vid.* by *Hippolytus.*

16. — *και tert.* by *copt* is not followed by Greeks.

*ibid.* Note that the *coptic expression* used both in verse 15 and here of *ποταμον υδατος* is followed partially here by A, which substitutes *το υδωρ* for *τον ποταμον.*

17. C omits *επι* before *τη γυναικι* [so Lachmann] and *Prim* writes *mulieri.* The other Latins *in muliere* or *in mulierem. Copt* (most MSS.) says ϩⲓⲭⲉⲛ (*επι*) but a few with *sah* ⲉⲧⲉⲥϩⲓⲙⲉ.

*ibid.* Now comes another curious and roundabout but very conclusive matter as to ℵ. ℵ changes the order of *ποιησαι πολεμον* to *πολεμον ποιησαι.* Not so *copt* or *sah.*

But immediately following he writes επιλοιπων (in one word), thus:

πολεμον ποιησαι
μετα των επιλοι
πων τον σπερμα
τος αυτης των τη

It seems to me almost certain that his eye dwelt on the *coptic* which expresses μετα των λοιπων by ⲙⲉⲛⲛ ⲛⲥⲉⲡⲓ.

Επιλοιπων is quite permissible Greek, but as ℵ is alone here one can see his mind working as clear as day, even after these 1500 years have elapsed, combining in his interesting polyglot mind the ⲥⲉⲡⲓ of *coptic* for λοιπος with the expressive Greek word επιλοιπος.

As to the change of order above of πολεμον ποιησαι, without *copt*, it merely shows (to me) that ℵ was *dwelling* on this place, and while considering it as he copied, let himself write as his mind dictated after his eye had left the written page.

At any rate either these things are due to the scribe of ℵ or to a forerunner who was similarly influenced by the Bohairic version under his eyes.

*Coptic* follows here with a substitution of της γυναικος (ⲡ̄ⲧⲥⲉⲓⲙⲓ) for αυτης after σπερματος, which no Greeks share, and that ℵ did not follow such things lends countenance to the theory that he did not *intend* to conform to coptic rather than Greek. In the same way the substitution by ℵ of θεου for ῑῡ χ̄ῡ [*non copt*] is merely an *error oculi* from the θεου above which occurs in the *same place* in his line:

τολασ του θ̄ῡ και ε
χοντων την μαρ
τυριαν του θ̄ῡ και ε
σταθη επι την

xiii. 1. *Copt* makes the order θηριον αναβ. εν τη θαλασση with 62/3 80 and 23, but 23 has απο της θαλ. and 62/3 80 εκ της θαλ.

*ibid.* The order of "ten horns and seven heads" of most Greeks is also that of *copt.*

*ibid.* All Horner's coptic MSS. appear to conspire with

ⲙ̅ ⲛ̅ⲭⲗⲟⲩ, that is *four* crowns instead of δεκα διαδηματα. There is no confusion in *sahidic*, which gives the numeral δεκα in full (ⲙⲛⲧⲉ). ℵ greek is clear for δεκα, except that he changes the order from δεκα διαδημ. to διαδηματα δεκα, as if he had paused, being surprised at the coptic ⲙ̅ and then, being quite convinced that *coptic* was wrong, had written in δεκα afterwards in full.

xiii. 1. *Copt* omits βλασφημιας but not *sah* nor any Greeks. It is a perpetual wonder how *all* Horner's coptic codices conspire in such things.

2. λεοντων for λεοντος of ℵ 14–92 and *syr* Σ is not agreed to by *copt* or *sah*; so that we see ℵ using *all* the authorities.

3. — ειδον is agreed to by *copt*. Coptic somewhat amplifies the first clause without Greek support.

και εθαυμασεν ολη η γη (or η γη ολη) of nearly all Greeks is agreed to by *copt*.

The curious οπισω here is confirmed by *copt*.

4. — τον δρακοντα *usque ad* προσεκυνησαν *sec.* by *copt* (apparently all Horner's MSS.) is witnessed to by 1 29 114 of the Greeks, although it seems clearly to be only an error from homoioteleuton. Note that ℵ does *not* omit, nor *sah*.

*ibid.* "saying who is like to *this* wild beast" *copt*. *Cf. syr* S. No Greeks, but *Prim* adds *illi*, and as showing that the reading is old, *Iren* confirms it.

*ibid.* — και (*ante* τις *sec.*) by all Gk uncials *etc.* agrees with *copt*.

5. "Great blasphemies" *copt* (— και) is not confirmed by *sah* nor by ℵ nor by other Greeks or Latins.

*ibid.* Note that 14–92 write πολεμησαι for ποιησαι as all coptic, but not ℵCAP, although this was reintroduced later by B and cursives with πολεμον ποιησαι. No doubt the harder reading ποιησαι is to be preferred.

*ibid.* Here occurs a very curious thing. ℵ supplies ο θελει after ποιησαι, having omitted εξουσια (alone) before ποιησαι. There is no authority for this (*except aeth*: "signa quae voluit") nor any reason for the introduction of the words, although the correctors have not changed it. The coptic for εξουσια is ⲉⲣⲱⲓⲱⲓ. The coptic for ο θελει

is ⲉⲧⲉϩⲛⲉ. Balestri's *sah* = ⲉϫⲟⲩⲥⲓⲁ ⲉⲧⲣⲉϥⲙⲓϣⲉ, while Goussen loses the ⲉϫⲟⲩⲥⲓⲁ.

xiii. 6. The substitution of *αυτον* for *το ονομα αυτου* here by ℵ is not approved by *copt*.

7. The omission of the first part of the verse by CAP the 1 family and *Iren* is not countenanced by ℵ nor by *copt* but is by *sah*.

*ibid.* *Copt* expresses *επι πασαν φυλην* by "over all the tribes" in the plural, using however the word ⲫⲩⲗⲏ. ℵABP and most cursive Greeks add *και λαον* after *φυλην* (C *και λαους*). *Copt* drops it from similarity of ϩⲁⲥ (*lingua*) to ϩⲁⲟⲥ; so *Anonym* and *Auct de prom.*

8. ℵ* omits *ου* before *γεγραπται*, changing the sense (*from οὗ οὐ* [common txt *ὧν οὐ*]). Not so *copt*, which has ⲁⲛ.

*ibid.* ℵ* 95 114 add *αυτων* after *names* (or *name*); CA add *αυτου*. *Cf. copt* ⲛⲏ ⲉⲧⲉ ⲡⲟⲩⲣⲁⲛ.

*ibid.* *εν βιβλω* (— *τη*) by ℵ* 36 59 114. *Cf. copt* ⲡϫⲱⲙ definite article but feeble, not ⲡⲓϫⲱⲙ.

*ibid.* + *του* (*ante εσφαγμενου*) all uncials and most cursives, is strongly confirmed by *copt* "he who was."

9. *Copt* says "He who hath an ear *to hear* let him hear." Not expressed by Greeks.

10. — *δει αυτον*, and *αποκτανθησεται* (for *αποκτανθηναι*) by *syr* S and *gig* is found to be the construction of *coptic*. A$^{gr}$ omits *δει*. No Latins omit.

*ibid.* The closing clause is quite different in *copt*, omitting *ωδε*, and substituting at the end "blessed is he." *Cf. aeth* + et non admirandum satanae. No others wish to change this.

12. Compare the first clause in *copt*. Not so read by Greeks.

*ibid.* *προσκυνιν* (— *ινα*) for *ινα προσκυνησωσι* by ℵ compares exactly with *copt* and *sah* and *latt* (except *gig Prim Iren Anonym*).

13. *επι* (*pro εις*) of 56 119–123 and B *etc.* may be compared to *copt*, the same word ϩⲓϫⲉⲛ being used for the *επι* of all in the next verse.

14. "ut faciant" of *gig* for *ποιησαι sec.* finds an exact equivalent in the *copt* ⲭⲉ, and an echo in ℵ which (alone) adds *και* before *ποιησαι*.

xiii. 15. — ινα και λαληση η εικων του θηριου. *Copt* [*non sah*] is also omitted by *syr* S and (Σ) and *Hippol.* and by fourteen cursives, including 14–92, 23–55. But all our uncials (except C) and including ℵ, with *Iren*, confirm it.

The following clause in *coptic* is completely turned round, "And to kill" taking the place of και ποιηση at the head of the sentence. I do not find that this obtains among any Greeks, but ινα *sec.* is omitted by ℵ(C)ABP *etc. syr* S *gig Hipp etc.*

16. After δουλους the construction in *coptic* is different and δωση αυτοις χαραγμα is expressed by ⲉⲫⲉϣⲟⲗϩⲟϒ. The coptic runs (without και ινα): "He shall mark them in their right hand with their forehead."

The others do not change this phrase. Some of the Latins seem to be nearer.

17 *init.* — και ℵ*C and some curs.; *syr Hipp* (*bis*) *Iren* and *Anonym* go with *copt* and *sah* and *latin* against the rest.

*ibid.* μηδεις (*pro* μη τις) of the Egyptian codices 34–35–87 seems equivalent of both *copt* and *sah* "no one," and *copt* and *sah* use different words, each language however expressing "not anyone."

*ibid.* The order of ℵ 38 only

το χαραγμα του θηριου η το ονομα αυτου

is exactly the order of *copt*:

ϣⲱⲗϩ (— το) ⲛ̄ⲧⲉ ⲡⲓⲑⲏⲣⲓⲟⲛ ⲧⲟⲓ ϩⲓⲱⲧϥ ⲓⲉ ⲡⲉϥⲣⲁⲛ.

36 also agrees but says και for η.

C$^{gr}$, with *Lat* and *Syr*, seems to agree better with *sah* here.

A close examination of this passage will show enough variation among other documents to make our point as to ℵ and *copt* stand out all the clearer.

18. *Copt* says "(The) wisdom (is) here," against Greek and Latin order, but *sah* retains it with ⲡⲁⲓⲡⲙⲁ ⲛ̄ⲧⲥⲟⲫⲓⲁ.

*ibid.* ο εχων τον νουν is our received text. Nearly all Greeks however omit τον. 28 reads ουν for νουν; but ℵ* reads ους with only 16–39–69–102. *Copt* and *sah* both play the variation ϩⲏⲧ (= heart). Now ϩⲏⲧ and ϩⲏ can mean almost anything connected with *animus* or with the viscera, but not with ους. ℵ seems to have run wild here.

xiii. 18. ℵ (and 62/3 72) with *syr* S omit και ο αριθμος αυτου. Not so *copt*.

xiv. 1. και ιδου is omitted by *copt* and *gig* but retained by Greeks and by *sah*.

*ibid.* + το (*ante* αρνιον) most Greeks as well as *copt* and *syr* S.

*ibid.* + το (*ante* γεγραμμενον) by A alone, may be the equivalent of *copt* ⲉⲫⲥϩⲛⲟⲩⲧ.

2. *Copt* omits ως φωνην υδατων πολλων και but not ℵ.

*ibid.* ℵ omits μεγαλης after βροντης but not *copt*.

*ibid.* *Copt* says "and the voice which I heard was like to harpers" (— κιθαριζοντων εν ταις κιθαραις αυτων). No Greeks appear to omit the last part of the clause. (See *Prim.*)

3. αδοντων of 119–123 alone, αδουσων 100 (for αδουσιν) is to be compared with *copt* and *syr* [see below xv. 3].

*ibid.* *Copt* alone omits και *init.* [*non sah*].

*ibid.* *Copt* not only elides ὡς (with ℵBP and most) but says "*in* (ϩⲉⲛ) a new song" [ℵ* has a muddle here].

*ibid.* For μαθειν "to learn" *copt* alone seems to substitute "to know" (ⲉⲉⲓⲓ) as also *sah*. No Greeks alter, but *gig* with the Latins and *Prim* says *dicere*. St. Jerome (Apol. pro libr. contr. Jov.) says *cantare*. ⲉⲉⲓⲓ is rather curious, followed so close by the Greek εἰ μὴ (which *copt* renders ⲉⲃⲏϩ).

4. The form απαρχης of ℵ 16–39–69–102–114 (for απαρχη) is not agreed to by *copt* = ⲛ̄ⲁⲡⲁⲣⲭⲏ (*sah* ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲁⲡⲁⲣⲭⲏ).

5. *Copt* and *sah* agree as to ψευδος for δολος; *copt:* ⲛⲟⲩϫ, *sah:* ⲧⲁⲡⲣⲟ.

*Copt* and *sah* also have γαρ with ℵ and most cursives against CAP 12–59–67 81 100 114 *gig lux.*

*Prim* has *quia.*

*Copt* and *sah* omit the last clause with practically all.

6. ℵ*, with B and many Greeks, omits αλλον with *sah*, but all Horner's *coptic* MSS. seem to have it. It is represented by the little prefix ⲕⲉ and might be passed over (ⲉⲕⲉⲁⲅⲅⲉⲗⲟⲥ).

*ibid.* + επι (*ante* τους) is curious by ℵCAP 34–35 (*hiat* 87) and *Orig syr*; ⲛ̄ⲛⲏ *copt* may however be considered in this connection. On the other hand *sah* uses a double επι before της γης (ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ ⲉⲭⲙ̄).

xiv. 6. *Copt* varies the order, against Greek, reading λαον before γλωσσαν, but not all coptic MSS. The *copt* words are so similar, ϩⲗⲁⲟⲥ, ϩⲗⲁⲥ, that they were sure to be transposed by some. Compare *syr* S and *Prim* also.

*Sah* has ϩⲗⲁⲟⲥ at the end with the Greeks, and uses ⲁⲥⲡⲉ for γλωσσαν before it (connecting by ⲉⲓ instead of ⲛⲉⲙ as in *copt*).

*Copt* inserts "every" before φυλην, γλωσσαν, and λαον after its usual manner. Not so the Greeks. As ℵ does not follow this, it is quite clear he did not *intend* to adopt coptic readings.

7. Neither *sah* nor *copt* omit λεγοντα with ℵ.

*ibid.* *Copt* MSS. vary between *vox* (ⲥⲙⲏ) and *sonus* or *clamor* (ϫⲣⲱⲟⲩ). No Greeks vary φωνη.

*ibid.* + αυτω before τω ποιησαντι is not written by ℵ (see 7–16 *etc.*) nor αυτον τον ποιησαντα by B** *etc.*, but compare *copt* for this αυτον.

8. *Copt* writes ⲕⲉⲁⲩⲅⲉⲗⲟⲥ ⲙ̅ⲙⲁϩ̅. So P *etc.*, while ℵ substitutes δευτερος for αγγελος with *syr*.

*ibid.* + αυτω of *copt* and *syr* and *Prim* is not shared by ℵ, but ℵ* jumps from ηκολουθησεν verse 8 to verse 9 by omission due to homoioteleuton.

*ibid.* But rather a pretty thing occurs here at the close of verse 8, for ℵ$^{a}$, that early corrector, who supplies the lacuna of ℵ*, not only agrees with *copt* in omitting η πολις and οτι above, but here substitutes πεπτωκαν for πεποτικε of all the rest and syriac. And this agrees with *boh* ⲁⲩϩⲉⲓ [*non sah*]. What more is needed to tie the *bohairic* up to ℵ? We see ℵ* using *bohairic* involuntarily, and then we see ℵ$^{a}$ in the same place no doubt, perhaps in the very same *cabinet de travail*, revising as a διορθωτής, or perhaps even as an ἀντιβάλλων, and using probably the very same graeco-coptic exemplar which ℵ* used. This is important as regards ℵ$^{a}$ elsewhere, and I do not think this point has been brought out yet.

*ibid.* The order of (πεπτωκαν) τα εθνη παντα is that of 21–28–73–79–103 with *copt*.

9. For the αυτω of A (*pro* αυτοις) unique among the Greeks (with *Prim* only of Latins) compare ⲛ̅ⲥⲱϥ of

Horner's coptic codices BCD$^{mg}$EF*G against ⲛ̄ⲥⲱⲟⲩ of the rest and *sah.*

xiv. 9. — εν φωνη μεγαλη all Horner's *coptic* MSS., but not *sah* nor any Greeks.

*ibid.* For εἴ τις *copt* reads idiomatically ϫⲉ ⲫⲏ and some ϫⲉ ⲛⲏ. No Greeks, but 30–98 read οτι *pro* ει τις.

*ibid.* — επι *sec. copt* but no Greeks nor *sah.*

10. — και *init. copt* agrees only with greek 100. "*Bibit et ipse*" of *Cypr Jul Firm lux* agrees more closely with *sah* (ⲟⲛ).

*ibid.* *Copt* supplies "*wine*" before "*unmixed*," but no Greeks.

*ibid.* — αγιων *copt* [*non sah*] agrees only with A 26 77* 107 108. *Sah* has αγιων and (Goussen) adds αυτου with *aeth.*

11. *Copt* order here happens to agree with *textus receptus* αναβαινει (ανα) εις αιωνας against the rest of the Greeks.

*ibid.* *Copt* introduces the next clause by ϫⲉ, but thus no Greeks.

12. For ωδε *prim. copt* says "But he who," *cf.* 21 ὁ δὲ (*pro* ὧδε). *Copt* actually varies the expression: "But he who will endure with the saints," and for ωδε *sec.* continues "they (are they) who will keep . . . " Compare των τηρουντων of ℵ 36 38 56 95 (a notable group in this connection) for οι τηρουντες.

*ibid. fin.* + χριστου *copt* (all MSS.). So 21–28–73–79–80–100–103, but not *sah.*

13. For some time ℵ has been rather drifting away from *copt.* Here ℵ says λεγουσης εκ του ουρανου for εκ του ουρανου λεγουσης, whereas *copt* does not use this order *but* SAH *does*! *Copt* also amplifies the previous clause by writing: "And I heard *another great* sound"; not supported by other authorities.

*ibid.* — γραψον all coptic MSS. but two, and also *sah* (*Goussen*) which is *mut* immediately after. So also only 18 31 of Greeks.

For απαρτι 21–28–73–79–103 write απο αρτι. *Cf. copt*: ⲓⲥϫⲉⲛ ⲧⲛⲟⲩ.

Coptic pauses at απαρτι. And continues:

"Saith the spirit, that" (— ναι) = ⲫϫⲱ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲥ ⲛ̄ϫⲉⲡⲓⲡⲛⲁ ⲥⲓⲛⲁ. Here our friend ℵ* joins us, omitting

ναι, and maintaining the order of *text. rec.* λεγει το πνευμα. Only 16–39–69–102 also omit ναι (33 and 88 substitute και for ναι).

xiv. 13. But now *copt* strikes out with an amplification, only part of which is witnessed for by any Greeks. For "ἱνα αναπαυσωνται εκ των κοπων αυτων" *copt* says "That they may rest themselves *henceforth* from (in) their toils *of their works*." No Greeks do this, but 14–92 halve the conflation by writing απο των εργων αυτων for εκ των κοπων αυτων.

The Latin here uses *a laboribus suis*. It does not therefore look unlike an assimilation to a previous Latin which *copt* here indulges in, but amplifies. Our friend ℵ is rightly silent here, retaining εκ των κοπων αυτων τα γαρ εργα αυτων ακολουθι μετ αυτων, while *copt*, having put in εργων above, runs on: "(which) shall walk after them." A possible survival of this occurs in 39, reading ακολουθων. *Comitantur* for *sequuntur* by *Prim.* And not content with this, all Horner's coptic MSS. add a gloss: "*and that He may guide them down to a fountain of water of life.*"

14. — και ιδου *copt*. No others. But, noteworthy fact, ℵ omits και ειδον.

Now if any others made any change, my contention for insensible assimilation to coptic by ℵ might not apply, but here I think I may say we can put our finger again on a *mental process* of ℵ. He looks at his Greek and sees και ειδον και ιδου. Before starting to write, he glances at the coptic and sees ⲟⲩⲟⲩ ⲁⲓⲛⲁⲩ, then starts to write και ειδον (= ⲟⲩⲟⲩ ⲁⲓⲛⲁⲩ), but the *sound* of ⲁⲓⲛⲁⲩ in his mind causes him to write ιδου instead of ειδον; glancing back at the Greek he sees και ιδου (following και ειδον which he misses) and is satisfied. This seems a very simple and yet very adequate explanation to me of many things which cannot be accounted for otherwise.

*Syr* S also omits και ειδον with ℵ. So that we can take our choice of assimilation to the syriac column of his exemplar (see other instances elsewhere) or of this mental process *ex copt.*

In ℵ's copy, if και ειδον was present, it would be

written και ιδον (as CA), which still further confuses the eye, and probably led first to omission by *syr* S.

None of the Latins appear to omit either phrase.

xiv. 14. — της κεφαλης *copt.* *Copt* says merely "there being a crown of gold *upon him.*" Not followed by ℵ or any others [*sah* continues mute until xvi. 12].

*ibid.* — και *ult. copt* alone.

15. For εν μεγαλη φωνη of *text. rec.* nearly all Greeks have εν φωνη μεγαλη (1 has μεγαλη τη φωνη), but *copt* goes with *text. rec.* order, εν μεγαλη βοη.

*ibid.* + λεγων (*ante* τω καθημενω) *copt.* No Greeks.

*ibid.* While *syr* S and Σ shorten the reaping clause by omitting οτι εξηρανθη ο θερισμος της γης, *copt* does the same but supplies *the earth* in the previous clause, thus: "because the hour of (the) reaping *of the earth* came."

For του θερισαι note that ℵ 38 41–53* substitute του θερισμου and compare *copt* ⲛ̄ⲧⲉ ⲡⲱⲥⲓ, noticing the article ⲡ. But ℵ does not add "of the earth" here.

16. — και εθερισθη η γη *copt.* No Greeks.

17. It is rather curious that here **34–35–87** and 26–107 should write αγγελος αλλος, for αλλος αγγελος, when *copt* as usual *prefixes* ⲕⲉ to ⲁⲅⲅⲉⲗⲟⲥ.

*ibid.* *Copt* omits του ναου του εν, reading εκ του ουρανου. Apparently no Greeks (30* only).

*ibid.* — και αυτος *copt.* *Cf.* 98 [*non* 30]. But 30 and 98 are sisters, so that between them they give what lurked in their exemplar!

18. — επι 38. *Cf. copt.*

*ibid.* For κραυγη μεγαλη *copt* has "εν (with cursives only) μεγαλη βοη" (or κραυγη) with CP and most Greek cursives.

ℵAB *syr* S *gig h* 31 38 44 52 61 82 95 however substitute φωνη here. So that ℵ was not by any means slavish to his coptic. No Coptic MSS. have ⲥⲱⲙⲁ here as some of them elsewhere.

*ibid.* — οτι ηκμασαν αι σταφυλαι αυτης *copt* and only Greek 50 102*.

19. For εις την γην *copt* writes ⲉⲡⲕⲁⲣⲓ "against the earth." Now ℵ 38 97 (*syr* S) write επι της γης. Whence this επι? I call attention to ⲉⲡⲕⲁⲣⲓ which is not in itself

ⲉⲡⲓ ⲕⲁⲣⲓ as Greek, but ⲉ ⲡⲓ ⲕⲁⲣⲓ against or "*towards* | *the* | *earth*," but *looks like* Greek επι. [*Sah* wanting.]

xiv. 19. The order of 34–35–87 *την ληνον την μεγαλην του θυμου του θεου* is evidently intended to copy the order of *copt*:

ⲉϯ ⲛⲓⲱϯ ⲛ̅ⲥⲣⲱⲧ ⲛ̅ⲧⲉ ⲡⲉⲗⲗⲟⲛ ⲗ̅ⲫϯ

although *μεγαλην* here precedes *ληνον*. But in both cases it is moved back from the end of the verse.

20. — *απο* (*ante σταδιων*) *copt*. No others; but *copt* prefixes ⲛ̅ⲟⲩ to ϣⲟ.

*ibid.* ℵ* with 26–107 (against the other three family MSS. 41–42–53) and *syr* S substitute *διακοσιων* for *εξακοσιων* without other support. *Coptic* is plain with ⲭ̅ for 600, while in Greek it is the same. Two hundred in Coptic and Greek would be ⲥ̅. The confusion must be between the symbols ⲭ̅ for 600 and ⲕ̅ for 20 (Gk and Copt). It might arise from the *Latin* misreading ⓓⓒ for ⓒⓒ, hardly from the syriac.

xv. 1. *Copt* transposes *μεγα* and places it after *αλλο*, thus: ⲉⲕⲉⲛⲓⲱϯ. No Greeks.

2. *Copt* adds (as often) *παντας* before *νικωντας*. No Greeks.

*ibid.* *Copt* says ⲉ | ⲡⲓ | ⲑⲏⲣⲓⲟⲛ for *εκ του θηριου* and continues ⲛⲉⲗⲗ ⲧⲉϥϩⲩⲕⲱⲛ for *και εκ της εικονος αυτου*. Note that ℵ (with 7–16–39–45–69–102–104, 38 and 98) omits *εκ* here, and *cf. Lat*: vicerunt bestiam et imaginem illius.

*ibid.* *Copt omits εκ του χαραγματος αυτου* with most.

*ibid.* *Copt* continues ⲛⲉⲗⲗ ⲧⲏⲡⲓ ⲛ̅ⲧⲉ ⲡⲉϥⲣⲁⲛ. Note 18 only seems to elide the third *εκ*.

*ibid.* The last clause for *εχοντας κιθαρας του θεου* runs in *coptic* ⲉⲣⲉⲟⲩⲟⲛ ϩⲁⲛⲕⲩⲑⲁⲣⲁ ⲛ̅ⲧⲉ ⲫϯ ϫⲏ ⲛ̅ⲧⲟⲧⲟⲩ, which Horner renders simply "*having harps of God.*" The Egyptian group 34–35–87 with 36 have an addition after *υαλινην* and before *εχοντας* of *την μεμιγμενην πυρι*, evidently repeated from the beginning of the verse. Coptic does not have this nor do I see how the coptic here could have engendered the greek, for ⲉϥⲱⲟⲩϫⲧ ϩⲉⲛ ⲟⲩϫⲣⲱⲙ does not resemble ϫⲏ ⲛ̅ⲧⲟⲧⲟⲩ, only one letter being similar.

3. While above at xiv. 3, ℵ did not read *αδοντας* for *αδουσιν*, here it does with 119–123 only. This seems to agree

with *copt* and *syr* and the latins *h Prim*, *vg*, [*non gig Cypr*], but these have *et cantantes* with the Greek, while *copt* suppresses *και init.* This again is noteworthy for ℵ connecting with *Latin* and *Coptic.*

*Coptic* here changes the order, making it "the song of the Lamb and Moses (ⲙⲱⲩⲥⲏⲥ) the servant of God," instead of "the song of Moses the servant of God and the song of the Lamb," thus suppressing "the song of" in one place. The Greeks do not do this nor change the order, but 34–35–87, curiously enough, give us *φωνην* for *ωδην sec.* before *του αρνιου.* The coptic is clear ⲡ̄ⲧϩⲱⲗⲏ. I do not know how 34–35–87 got this. The sahidic is missing, but an arabic gloss in a coptic MS. says: "*Sah.* they sing the song of Musa the servant of God and the song of the lamb," so that it did not come from *sah.*

xv. 3. *Copt* again changes the order of *μεγαλα και θαυμαστα τα εργα σου* to "Great are thy works and they are wonderful"; continuing, "Lord God the Almighty, the righteous," thus divorcing *δικαιαι* from the next clause and inserting it here as a direct attribute (ⲡⲓⲑⲱⲙⲏ) to God. No Greeks do this (see 44). Observe however how it might have crept in from the *Latin*, for *gig* continues "juste et vere viae tuae." It was only necessary in an old Latin uncial to read *juste* following *omnipotens* ("domine deus omnipotens juste") to account for this in the *coptic.* See how they all hang together!

*Copt* continues "all thy ways are truth," repeating ⲑⲱⲙⲏ, (ⲛⲉⲕⲱⲱⲓⲧ ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ ϩⲁⲛⲱⲱⲉⲑⲱⲙⲏ ⲛⲉ), "(the) king of the nations."

The Greek is "*ο βασιλευς των αγιων.*" Notice first that ℵ* says *βασιλευ* (— *ὁ*), which is again a possible mental process from *copt* ⲡⲟⲩⲣⲟ, where, although the weak article appears, the end is suggestive of *βασιλευ* coupled with a natural mental attitude of "O King," while a Latin might have slipped in "Ô Rex" [as codex *b* did at Luke xvi. 24 "·o· pater" (*Buchanan*, new edn. of cod. Veron., Oxford 1911, pp. xvi., 149)].

Next observe a good deal of difference of opinion as to *των αγιων.* ℵ$^{a}$ABP and nearly all cursives agree with

*coptic*, substituting τωv εθvωv, but ℵ*, with C and three notable cursives, 18 56 95, together with *syr* S and Σ *arm* and Vulgate = τωv αιωvωv. *Am* however plays a variation with *caelorum* for *saeculorum*! *Gig Cypr* and *Ambr* are content with *gentium*, but *h* and *Prim* say *omnium gentium*, which even the *coptic* does not indulge in (*contra consuetudinem*). ℵ[a] changed αιωvωv to εθvωv, but seems again to have wished to make it αγιωv.

At any rate, in all this muddle we see that the Vulgate's *saeculorum* has the very respectable support of ℵ*C 18 56 95 *syr* S and Σ. αιωvωv and εθvωv are not similar in syriac nor to be confused, nor in coptic. So that ℵ* *etc.* seem here to be connected only with the *Latin*.

xv. 4 *init.* Prefix *some* coptic MSS. ⲟⲩⲟϩ. So 36 only.

*ibid.* The coptic expresses the opening phrase:

ⲛⲓⲙ ⲉⲧⲉⲛⲛⲉϥⲉⲣϩⲟϥ ϩⲁⲧϩⲏ ⲙ̅ⲡ̅ⲥ̅.

It will be observed that no Greeks have followed *copt* in its composite verb-form (ⲉⲣϩⲟϥ ϩⲁⲧϩⲏ "to fear before"); and it can also be seen how the Gk. σε is almost obliterated in ⲉ ⲧⲉⲛ ⲛⲉϥ or ⲉⲧⲉ ⲛ ⲛⲉϥ. This σε is omitted by CABP 1 *etc.*, but it is noteworthy that instead of τις ου μη φοβηθη σε κυριε, ℵ 95 write τις σε ου φοβηθη bringing σε immediately after τις, and causing the Greek μη to disappear (*cf. syr*) although ⲁⲛ after ⲉⲣϩⲟϥ is present in *some* of the coptic MSS.

*ibid.* Only 28 says κ̅σ̅ for κ̅ε̅ (*cf. copt* ⲥ̅ⲥ̅).

*ibid.* 95 repeats τις ου before δοξασει, but in this appears alone.

*ibid.* *Copt* omits altogether οτι μονος οσιος. *Sah* is wanting, but arabic glosses in coptic MSS. say it was present in *sah.* There is some confusion and variation as to this phrase in Gk. MSS.

*ibid.* *Copt* says "worship *thy name*" for "προσκυν. ενωπιον σου." No Greeks have this, but A 46=88=101–59 95 add κυριε after ενωπιον σου. This *could* occur from misreading coptic ⲭⲉ as ⲕ̅ⲉ̅, for ⲭⲉ immediately follows ⲙ̅ⲡⲉⲕⲣⲁⲛ introducing the last clause.

*ibid.* ℵ (alone) adds ενωπιον in this clause, possibly suggested by the *copt* ⲟⲩⲱⲛϩ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ.

xv. 5. *Copt* omits και before ιδου. Not so the Greeks, although they elide ιδου which *copt* has very definitely: ϩⲏⲡⲡⲉ.

6. + οι (*ante* εχοντες) of CA *etc.* = *copt.*

εκ του ναου is lost by B and a company of cursives including 34–35–87. This may be due to its being set back by *coptic* as in greek 25–58–70–78–84–94 and *syr* S: "εκ του ναου οι εχοντες τας επτα πληγας."

The same word for ναος in vv. 5 and 6 is used by *copt* ⲉⲣϥⲉⲓ, although Horner translates ver. 5 *tabernacle* and ver. 6 *temple*; while a few Greeks (10–49–77–91–96–110 and 56 *Compl.* [*non* 17–37]) substitute ουρανου here for ναου.

*ibid.* The + οι ησαν before ενδεδυμενοι of B and many cursives (including 34–35–87) may be compared to *copt* ⲉⲟⲩⲟⲛ ϩⲁⲛϩⲃⲱⲥ. Surely, if ℵ had *intended* to copy *copt* he would have done this too.

*ibid.* Now as to the important part of λιθον or λινον in this verse. It is to be observed that ℵ is very definite with καθαρους λινους λαμπρους. Coptic uses ⲛ̄ⲓⲁⲩ for linen although it has many other words to express flax and the products of flax. The trouble might have come from ϩⲓⲱⲧⲟⲩ which I take it means "*super eos*" [the phrase is ⲉⲟⲩⲟⲛ ϩⲁⲛϩⲃⲱⲥ ⲛ̄ⲓⲁⲩ ⲧⲟⲓ ϩⲓⲱⲧⲟⲩ] and here we have a clue, for it has a kind of resemblance to ϩⲓⲱⲛⲓ, which would involve *lapis*, favoured by the Greeks CA.

*ibid.* επι (*pro* περι) of 21–28, 62/3–72, 73–79–103 agrees with *syr* S, and *copt* (ⲉϫⲉⲛ). (It is rather curious to see how the 1 family divides here, for while 62/3 writes επι, 1. 12 omit the word.)

*ibid.* επι αυτων τα στηθη *copt* says, supplying ⲧⲟⲩ. So *syr* S and Σ, but no Greeks.

7. Here the dropping of ἐν by ℵ* and a good many cursives, of επτα *sec.* by ℵ and 18 *fu* only, is not supported by *copt.*

At the close however all *copt* MSS. add αμην with only ℵ 12–46=88=101–59 28 and *syr* S.

And *copt* says "unto age of the age" with 23–55 which often sympathise. As a matter of fact some *copt* write ϣⲁⲉⲛⲉⲣ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉ ⲡⲓⲉⲛⲉⲣ with 23–55, while others make it ⲡⲓⲉⲛⲉⲣ, των αιωνων, as Horner's text. It is quite

evident however from where 23–55 got their εις τον αιωνα του αιωνος.

xv. 8. The unique order of ℵ here "εις τον ναον εισελθειν" for εισελθειν εις τον ναον is *not* supported by *copt* which has ⲛ̄ⲓ ⲉϩⲟⲩⲛ ⲉⲡⲓⲉⲣϥⲉⲓ, although repeating this *cop ic* aloud "ni ekhoun epierphei" really almost corresponds to the sound of ℵ's greek order.

xvi. 1. The order μεγαλης φωνης of CAB and about a third of the cursives agrees with *copt.* As ℵP do not join nor 34–35–87 nor other important documents I take it that the original Greek order is φωνης μεγαλης as in the *textus receptus.*

*ibid.* ουρανου for ναου of 13–23–55 only (comprising this entire family group here) is witnessed to by all the Coptic MSS. and three Latins. We may safely say that 13–23–55 then derive plainly from a graeco-copt. Such proof has never been offered before. It is new and valuable. Horner quotes "13 demid. tol. lips. ar$^{e}$," but he did not know that in 13 it was no accident. Our family groups are now proving of considerable importance, as all three MSS. of this group are agreed here and *no other Greeks.* It is an old error of *copt.*

*ibid.* — επτα (ante αγγελοις), *copt.* No Greeks, and arabic gloss in *copt* says it is present in *sah.*

*ibid.* — και (ante εκχεατε) is witnessed to by both 1 and Compl. groups and *gig* with *copt.*

*ibid.* *Copt* does not have "*seven* vials" with ℵCA *etc. syr* S *gig*, but says "*your* vials."

*ibid.* Instead of εις την γην *copt* merely says "below" "ⲉⲡⲉⲥⲏⲧ," that is some *copt* MSS. and Horner text. Others (quite a large number) say ⲉⲡⲑⲟⲛⲧ or ⲉⲡⲑⲟⲛⲧⲉⲛ. There is an old corruption here. And one MS. conflates ⲉⲡⲉⲥⲏⲧ ⲉⲡⲑⲟⲛⲧⲉⲛ. Latin *h* omits εις την γην altogether.

2. + αγγελος *post* πρωτος 12 21–28 34–35–87 36 59 73–79–80–100–103. So *copt.* [ℵ is missing, owing to an omission, from και απηλθεν *init.* up to and including την γην, which may very likely have something to do with the omission of την γην in verse 1 in the coptic.]

xvi. 2. *και sec.* is omitted by 59 (which has coptic sympathy) as by *copt.*

*ibid.* For *επι την γην copt* writes ⲉϫⲉⲛ ⲡⲓⲕⲁϩⲓ.
For *εις τους ανθρωπους* ϩⲉⲛ ⲛⲓⲣⲱⲙⲓ.

*ibid.* Notice that for *κακον και πονηρον copt* supplies only one adjective (ⲉⲫϩⲱⲟⲩ) while A 123* omit *κακον* and 119 (sister of 123) omits *και κακον.* This is very significant as to A. Note also that ℵ alone varies the order *πονηρον και κακον* and the picture of ℵA consulting coptic is complete. No others change, except 59, which indulges in *χαλαιπον* for *κακον* in its text, apparently an attempt to *describe* the plague-sickness.

*ibid.* Coptic order confirms *προσκυνουντας τη εικονι αυτου* which nearly all Greeks have, and ℵ 17 119–123 use the accusative *την εικονα αυτου.* It may be interesting to enquire *why* here (and elsewhere) such things happen as these changes of case in a few MSS.

3. ℵ* omits the first part of the verse, substituting *εἰς,* without authority.

*ibid.* Again 59 comes in (with 91 104 only) in supporting *επι* of *copt* (ⲉϫⲉⲛ) for *εἰς* of the rest before *την θαλασσαν.*

*ibid.* ℵ writes *ωσι* for *ως.* *Copt* ⲙ̅ⲫⲣⲏϯ (phreti).

*ibid.* *Copt* order is *ψυχη πασα.* No Greeks.

*ibid.* *Copt* retains *ζωσα* omitted by a number of cursives including 34–35–87. CA 95 say *ζωης* but *copt* ⲉⲧ | ⲟⲛϩ.

*ibid.* For *εν τη θαλασση,* ℵ (alone) says *επι της θαλασσης.* Note that while ϩⲉⲛ is used by *coptic* (= in), it has a wider significance and means "among," so ϩⲉⲛ ⲛⲓⲣⲱⲙⲓ "among the men" (Mallon, p. 158). Here ℵ actually changes the sense. Every living soul perished ON the sea, or IN the sea are two very different things. ℵ may have dwelt on this verse and looked at the coptic, some of whose MSS. substitute ⲛⲓⲙⲱⲟⲩ for ϥⲓⲟⲙ, while one conflates with ϩⲉⲛ ϥⲓⲟⲙ ⲛⲓⲙⲱⲟⲩ.

*ibid.* The differing order of *εν τη θαλασση απεθανεν* of 21–28–73–79–100 only occurs in *one* Coptic MS.

4. *Copt* has *αγγελος* with the minority Greeks.

*ibid.* *επι pro εις prim.* of *copt* agrees with 18 31 100 *vg Prim,* but the second *εις* (or *επι* of 18 31) is suppressed by *copt,*

which uses the usual ⲡⲉⲓⲱ. Note that ℵCAP 10–17–21–49–77–91–96–110 59–67 73–79–81–100–103 95 114 all omit εις *sec.* (while in the commentaries of 49 and 59 they have επι των υδατων). *One* coptic MS. supplies ⲉϫⲉⲛ *secundo loco.*

xvi. 4. The little prefix ⲁϥ to ⲁⲩⲉⲣⲥⲛⲟϥ seems to point to εγενοντο of A 36 56 95 100 *syr gig h Prim,* as against εγενετο αιμα of the rest.

5. Some *copt* omit και *init.* No Greeks.

*ibid.* Alone 95 adds του επι after αγγελου. This might come in various ways from *copt* (ⲉⲡⲓⲁⲅⲅⲉⲗⲟⲥ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉ ⲡⲓⲱⲱⲟⲩ) and it is clear that the eye of the scribe of 95 also wandered in and out over a graeco-coptic MS.

*ibid.* — κυριε *copt* with most [two coptic MSS. have it].

*ibid.* *Copt* (all MSS.) omits και ο οσιος with 123 only [*sah* (still missing) does not, according to gloss in a coptic MS., but with ℵP *etc.* suppresses και, reading "*the* holy," not with CAB who suppress και ὁ]. There is some division of opinion here among the Greeks, but none omit outright except 123, nor do the Latins.

There is however no justification for 56, who adds και ο αγιος after οσιος, nor for 59, who adds εν τοις εργοις σου after οσιος.

6. ℵ says αιματα for αιμα *primo loco* with 16–39–69–102 and 36 but *not copt,* all MSS. appearing to read ⲡⲓⲥⲛⲟϥ or ⲡⲥⲛⲟϥ.

*ibid.* Some of the coptic MSS. substitute *martyrs* for αγιων and so Horner's text. Six of them do not, and the arabic gloss says the sahidic also read "the saints." No Greeks or Latins or Syr support μαρτυροι. *Syr* S alone with greek 32 and 109 (*gr et arm*) invert the order προφητων και αγιων.

*ibid.* — και *sec.* by 40 is the coptic way of reading (most MSS.).

*ibid.* ℵ changes the order to αιμα εδωκας αυτοις πιειν for αιμα αυτοις εδωκας πιειν, and although this is not the exact coptic order it is nearer than that of any other Greeks = *syr* S and *gig.*

Coptic writes:

ⲁⲕ† ⲥⲛⲟϥ ⲛⲱⲟⲩ ⲉⲥⲱ
εδωκας αιμα αυτοις πιειν

xvi. 6. Nearly all Greeks omit γαρ with *copt*, but only 16–39–69 –102 and 36 prefix οτι (with *copt* ⲭⲉ) to αξιοι εισι (*Prim* quoniam). ℵ however adds οπερ, meaning "who indeed are worthy."

The mind of ℵ is always interesting to follow, as he sticks piously to his task. But ⲭⲉ must have suggested this "*qui quidem*." *Cf.* also *am lips* who supply *ut* before *digni sunt.*

7. Of course *copt* omits αλλου εκ with all Greeks. This "alterum ab altari" of Vulgate Latins seems to me undoubtedly a mere conflation of *gig*'s error of alterum (he writes no more than this) for altarem. *Prim* says *aliam vocem*, to turn the difficulty, I suppose.

*ibid.* Again *copt* seems to couple δικαιος with θεος following παντοκρατωρ (*vide supra*) and to divorce it from κρισεις by eliminating δικαιαι and substituting παντες, thus: "*Yea Lord God the Almighty the righteous all Thy judgments are true.*" Some *copt.* MSS. omit "*all.*" No Greeks do this nor Latins (as vera here agrees with *judicia* and is not *verae* as at xv. 3 with *viae* where *gig* wrote "juste et vere viae" confounding for others *juste* with *justae.*

Only 14 [*non* 92] omits και *ult.*

Nor does ℵ here change κυριε to κυριος.

8. While CABP omit αγγελος, ℵ does not, thus agreeing with *copt.* The Egyptian group 34–35–87 also retains it, with *vg* some latins and *Prim.*

*ibid.* For καυματισαι τους ανθρωπους εν πυρι *copt* writes: ⲉⲉⲣⲕⲁⲩⲙⲁ ⲉⲭⲉⲛ ⲡⲓⲣⲱⲙⲓ ϩⲉⲛ ⲟⲩⲛⲓⲱϥ̀ ⲛ̄ⲕⲁⲩⲙⲁ.

This emphasis of ⲉⲭⲉⲛ does not appear elsewhere, while ℵ 81 actually drop εν before πυρι with one coptic MS. "B," and 18 with *syr* S drops εν πυρι, for which *copt* substitutes εν μεγαλω καυματι, using the Greek word καυμα, and agrees with *Anonym*, "ustione magna."

9. In this following verse *copt* drops καυμα μεγα. This is quite significant, for among the Greeks καυματι μεγαλω is here substituted for καυμα μεγα by 18 21–28–73–79–80–81***–100–103 (aestu magno *latt*). So there was an ancient muddle of punctuation here. *Anonym*, having agreed with *copt* above "*ustione magna*" in verse 8, agrees again here omitting entirely *aestu magno.*

ℵ here steers a clear course, but I think a reference to the original gives away the secret, for εκαυματισθησαν is there found so divided that it gives to the eye καυματι only on one line, thus:

πυρι και εκαυματι
σθησαν οι ανοῑ καυ
μα μεγα και εβλα

xvi. 9 *fin.* Most Coptic MSS. substitute ⲙ̄ⲙⲫ† for αυτω (but six do not) and so Horner text, without other authority.

10. Here ℵ joins the other uncials in omitting αγγελος. Not *copt.*

*ibid.* For εκ του πονου, ℵ, with 17 67 only, substitutes απο. Compare the ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲉⲛ of *copt.*

11. For this απο του πονου of verse 10, ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲉⲛ ⲡⲓⲙ̄ⲕⲁϩ, *copt* repeats exactly the same in this verse for εκ των πονων αυτων.

Note that 56 62/3 and 72 adopt this singular εκ του πονου while retaining αυτων (which 108 only drops). The conjunction of 56 62/3–72 here is interesting; 56 we know already favors *copt* to some extent, and we have shown that 62/3–72 occasionally come away from the rest of the 1 group in the same direction.

*ibid.* Another muddle follows, which ℵ recognises. He elides και εκ των ελκων αυτων, with 87 [*non* 34–35] 43 67 and 109$^{gr*}$ (109$^{arm}$ εκ πονου χολου) and also omits εκ των εργων αυτων (with *gig*). ℵ writes:

και εβλασφημη
σαν τον θ̄ν̄ τον ου
ρανου εκ των πο
νων αυτων και ου
μετενοησαν

I think what happened was this. From the fourth line down his copy really read

νων αυτων και
εκ των εργων
αυτων και ου
μετενοησαν
εκ των εργων
αυτων

If we assume εργων by ℵ with *copt* for ελκων it gives

ℵ two lines with εκ των εργων and accounts for the omissions.

[*Primasius* does not give the verse, and *Anonym* is very short: "et paenitentiam non egerunt."] Now *copt* substitutes εργων for ελκων in the first clause, and adds πονηρων to εργων in the second clause.

The syriac is clear.

[Here *sah* begins for part of verse 12.]

xvi. 12. *Copt* has αγγελος, but *sah* omits with ℵCABP and most Greeks [*sah* only runs to ευφρατης and then breaks off (to verse 17)].

— του *ante* ευφρατην ℵBP is not shared by *copt*, which has the strong article ⲡⲓ, while *sah* has ⲡ, as often before proper names.

*ibid.* — αυτου *sec.* by 1–12–46=88=101–59–67 36 81 114 is shared by *copt*.

13. ℵ* omits εκ του στοματος του δρακοντος και εκ του στοματος του θηριου και. No doubt by error; similarly C 9–27 39 44–52–82 omit εκ του στοματος του δρακοντος και; and 16 36 omit και εκ του στοματος του θηριου. This last is omitted by one coptic MS. $H^{copt}$. So we see that these Greeks merely made blunders from the repetition of στοματος, and the coptic checks ℵ nicely here.

*ibid.* We have already seen that ℵ prefers ωσι to ως (*vide supra*) when looking at coptic ⲱⲥⲫⲣⲏ†. Now, ℵ* writes εϊωσει βατραχους (merely changed by $ℵ^{a}$ to εϊωσει βατραχοι) for ομοια βατραχοις. So that the final † in the coptic word seems really to have caught his ear.

14. *Copt* omits εκπορευεσθαι, saying "doing signs from among (ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲉⲛ) the kings of the earth." So that ℵ's εις τους βασιλεις for επι τους βασ. does not seem well taken.

*ibid.* As to της γης και and της οικουμενης ολης see the collation and note 56 59 $109^{arm}$ and *syr* S. *Copt* writes "of the earth," omitting και της οικουμενης ολης.

*ibid.* Both ℵ and A omit εκεινης with 14–92 38 and 95 *Tich gig Anonym* and *vg* (against *Prim* and *Auct de prom* of Latins) with all coptic MSS. [*hiat sah*], while A 95 of Greeks gives the coptic order της μεγαλης ημερας (— εκεινης).

xvi. 16. — τον (*ante* τοπον) ℵ 62/3 72 (*latt*) is the reading of *copt* (some MSS. : ⲉⲩⲣⲁ = ⲉⲟⲩⲣⲁ, others ⲉⲡⲓⲣⲁ).

A appears to go wild here with ποταμον, yet a sight of the coptic with ⲡⲓ might have led to this.

17. [Here *sah* begins again.] — αγγελος *sah* (*non copt*) with AB *etc.* ℵ* substitutes οτε for ο εβδομος αγγελος.

επι for εις by ℵAB *etc.* is read by *copt* (ⲉϫⲉⲛ).

*ibid.* *Copt* says "and he cried a great sound." The Greeks do not vary from και εξηλθεν φωνη μεγάλη, nor *sah*, but A and some omit μεγαλη, as apparently does *sah*.

*ibid.* — του ουρανου *copt* and *sah* and A 14–92 95 *syr* S ; (ℵ omits του ουρανου, but also απο του θρονου, substituting του θεου for the whole ; we may assume however, I think, that his text lacked του ουρανου.)

18. ανθρωπος εγενετο *pro* οι ανθρωποι εγενοντο A, and εγενετο ανθρωπος only 38. So exactly *copt* with ⲣⲱⲙⲓ, while *sah* distinctly ⲡⲉⲣ̈ⲣⲱⲙⲉ.

*ibid.* — τηλικουτος σεισμος ουτω μεγας *copt* alone, but *not sah.*

19. ℵ* alone η πολις for αι πολεις with *latt.* Compare *copt* ⲛⲓⲃⲁⲕⲓ clearly αι πολεις, but ⲛⲓ to the *ear* is close to Aleph's ʜ, while *sah* not ⲙ̄ⲙⲃⲁⲕⲓ but actually ⲙ̄ⲙⲡⲟⲗⲓⲥ.

*ibid.* του δουναι for δουναι ℵ and a few (21–28–73–79–80–100–103 22** 47) *Cf. copt* ⲉ☥ (ut daret *Prim*).

*ibid. fin.* — αυτου ℵ alone (*rescript* in 123) and *gig, with coptic exactly* ! [*Hiat sah.*]

20. "And the mountains found not *their place.*" *copt* alone.

21. "And stones as of talents in weight" *copt* alone. But *Prim* = "talenti ponderis" (— ὡς). ℵ* (*suppl. ipse*) 18 40 omit ως.

*ibid.* "came from out of Heaven" *copt* for καταβαινει εκ τ. ουρ. *Cf.* εγενετο of *syr* Σ ("ruit" *Prim*).

xvii. 2. εποιησαν πορνιαν *pro* επορνευσαν ℵ alone. *Cf. copt:* ⲁⲩⲉⲣⲡⲟⲣⲛⲉⲩⲓⲛ.

4. For the και τα ακαθαρτα της πορνιας αυτης και της γης of ℵ alone, compare *copt* where αυτης *and* της γης find a place, while A *etc.* give αυτης, and B *etc.* give της γης.

6. — την *ante* γυναικα 35–87 (*hiat* 68) = *copt* and *latt.* ℵ* 38 say τω αιματι for εκ του αιματος *prim.* This with *latt.* This agrees with Horner's translation "with the blood" ; the coptic is ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲉⲛ ⲡⲓⲥⲛⲟϥ, which can

clearly agree with the ordinary Greek εκ του αιματος. Why therefore should we try to connect ℵ with a coptic form? That is very simple. Coptic follows this with ⲛⲉⲁ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲉⲛ ⲡⲥⲛⲟϥ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉ ⲙⲁⲣⲧⲩⲣⲟⲥ in the second place, which not only justifies Horner's "with" in the first place, but connects ℵ* 38 with this. They write τω αιματι των αγιων και εκ του αιματος των μαρτυρων.

xvii. 6 *fin.* *Copt* omits ιδων αυτην θαυμα μεγα. 14–92 omit αυτην, while ℵ 38 *syr* S alone vary the order to θαυμα μεγα ιδων αυτην. There must be a connection and a reason for this. Notice how it occurs. *Copt* merely says "And I wondered." ℵ says "And I wondered a great wonder," adding ιδων αυτην afterwards. *Copt* expresses "I wondered" by ⲁⲓⲉⲣⲱϥⲫⲏⲣⲓ.

8. — και *sec.* of *copt* agrees with *syr* S.

I call attention to this because following immediately we get the θαλασσης for αβυσσου of *syr* S alone (which it does elsewhere, xi. 7). *Copt* is clearly "*abyss*" with ϥⲛⲟⲩⲛ, but this could easily be confused with ϥⲓⲟⲩ, in both cases the article ⲡ becoming ϥ, and both appearance and sound being similar, as the sound in syriac as well.

*ibid.* αναβαινων *copt* for μελλει αναβαινειν. *Cf. lat.*

*ibid.* "they whose name." *Cf.* το ονομα AB *etc. Hipp.*

*ibid.* *Copt* puts a stop after ζωης and says "Since the beginning of the creation of the world they are looking at the wild beast;" and continues "because it *is* and it is not *and it fell*" (ⲁϥϩⲉⲓ). No Greeks vary from παρεστιν or παρεσται (και παλιν παρεστε ℵ*). [*Sah* still wanting until xvii. 12 ]

9. *Copt* for ωδε ο νους ο εχων σοφιαν has "He who hath heart with wisdom let him understand."

*ibid.* — επτα *sec. copt* agrees with B 40 14–92. I think B comes in here by chance. With 40 and 14–92 it is otherwise.

*ibid.* "Upon which the woman is sitting" *copt*, for οπου η γυνη καθηται επ αυτων is a turn of phrase not countenanced by Greeks, but = *latt.* Only 80 omits επ αυτων.

*ibid. fin.* επτα βασιλεις εισιν ℵ. So *copt* (*ver.* 10 *init. apud editt. aliq.*).

xvii. 10. For εἰς *copt* gives αλλος.
*Copt* adds και before ὁ αλλος. So 62/3 72, and 56 (ο δε αλλος) and *latt*.
For ουπω ηλθεν *copt* substitutes "*was not* yet," but continues "and if he should *come*." Finally, *copt* closes "he will stay a little," or, "he stays a little" (ϥⲛⲁⲟϩⲓ ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲕⲟⲩⲭⲓ) for ολιγον αυτον δει μειναι. Compare μινεζει for δει μειναι by ℵ* (μινε δει ℵ[a]).

11. — και *quart*. *Copt* and 45 81* 114 }
— εστι *tert*. *Copt* and 30* 98 *syr* S }

*ibid.* "and he *will go* to destruction." The rest do not seem to vary from υπαγει and *vadit*, except *Auct de prom*, and *Primasius* with *ibit*.

12. "these who received not yet an authority as kings for an hour having followed the wild beast" by *copt* appears singular in construction. Not followed by others.

[Here *sah* begins again].

13. Here also *copt* exchanges (alone) positions of εξουσιαν and δυναμιν, reading: "These have one mind with an authority; they will give their power to the wild beast," eliding και *sec*. Not so others. *Sah* shortens to: ⲛⲁⲓ ⲥⲉⲛⲁⲣ̄ ⲟⲩϩⲏⲧ ⲟⲩⲱⲧ ⲛ̄ⲥⲉ† ⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲩⲃⲱⲗ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲧⲉⲩ ⲉⲝⲟⲩⲥⲓⲁ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲑⲏⲣⲓⲟⲛ.

14. — και το αρνιον *copt* two MSS. [not *sah*]. A[copt] N[copt] = "he overcoming them."

*ibid.* + των *ante* κυριων and βασιλεων is not countenanced by Greeks. Nor + οι *ante* εκλεκτοι and *ante* πιστοι, as *copt* has it.

*ibid.* *Copt* also says και οι κλητοι (ⲛⲉⲓⲙ ⲛⲏ ⲉⲧⲑⲁϩⲉⲓⲙ) μετ αυτου. Compare *vg gig* "et qui cum illo sunt." No others.

15. ειπεν (*pro* λεγει) A and *copt sah syr* S *vg Tich Prim Anon*.

*ibid.* For πορνη *copt* [*not sah*] substitutes γυνη. Note conflation of some Gk cursives.

*ibid.* *Copt* shortens λαοι και οχλοι εισι και εθνη και γλωσσαι to: ϩⲁⲛⲗⲁⲟⲥ ⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲓⲙ ϩⲁⲛⲓⲱϣ ⲛ̄ⲉⲑⲛⲟⲥ. Not so Greeks. Only 59 omits anything and that και οχλοι εισι, while *copt* drops the γλωσσαι altogether, combining λαοι

οχλοι and εθνη into "the whole people and entire nations." *Sah* writes ϯλλαος ⲛⲉ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲙⲫⲩⲗⲏ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲛⲁⲥⲡⲉ, retaining γλωσσαι (ⲁⲥⲡⲉ), but using φυλη for εθνη and also dropping και οχλοι εισι with 59.

xvii. 16. *Copt* and *sah* agree to substitute ⲛⲉⲙ for επι here, with nearly all others και.

*ibid.* *Copt* omits και *prim.* but expands ηρημωμενην ποιησουσιν αυτην και γυμνην to: "they will desolate her, they will make her naked." *Cf.* B** *etc.* including 34–35–87.

*ibid.* — και *ult. copt.* Not *sah* nor others.

*ibid.* — εν ℵP and *latt* but NOT *copt sah.* 34–35–87 with B and the important 40 56 61, all hearty coptic and syriac sympathisers, also omit εν with the Latins. Surely this, although apparently an insignificant place, is ABSOLUTELY CONCLUSIVE for a concurrent polyglot. Here we have ardent syriac and coptic sympathisers in ℵP 34–35–87 40 56 61 abandoning *syr* and *coptic* where the preposition is practically indispensable, to follow the *Latin.* See what they do in other places, *against the Latin*, to make this important point clear. [See below xviii. 2 A *contra* ℵ.]

17. For "και ποιησαι μιαν γνωμην" (omitted by $A^{gr}$ and some cursives) *copt* expresses: "and for them to be in one mind" (ⲟⲩⲟⲩⲟⲩ ⲉⲑⲣⲟⲩⲱⲟⲩⲡⲓ ϩⲉⲛ ⲟⲩⲥⲛⲱⲙⲓ ⲛⲟⲩⲱⲧ). Note 56 95 *syr* S add αυτων.

*ibid.* — και (*ante* δουναι) *Cf. gig* and *vg* "ut dent" (— et).

*ibid.* { — την (*ante* βασιλειαν) *copt* no others, but
— αυτων *sec.* of *copt* is agreed to by 21–73–79–100–103 106, and A substitutes αυτω for αυτων, making it αυτω τω θηριω, which agrees with coptic. (*Sah* begins to be mutilated here, until xviii. 13.)

*ibid.* *Copt* agrees with the plurality in the final clause; only, according to coptic system, writing εκτελεσθησονται τα ρηματα του θεου (ⲱⲁⲧⲟⲩⲭⲱⲕ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ).

18. ℵ omits ἡ here with 25–58–70–78–84–94 51–90 95 but *not* by *copt.* This would equal latin *habens*, but all we know seem to write *quae habet.* Possibly this omission *is* due to an early Latin which translated *habens* and which ℵ was following.

xviii. 1. Note — και *init.* by *copt* with ℵABP and most cursives,

*Hipp Aug*$^{anon}$ and *gig*, but *not* by the Egyptian group 35–35–87.

xviii. 1. + αλλον All, including Egyptian group.

*ibid.* "From his face with his glory" for εκ της δοξης αυτου *copt* has no such addition in Greeks Syr or Latin.

2. ϩⲉⲛ ⲟⲩⲛⲓϣϯ ⲛ̅ϩⲣⲱⲟⲩ *copt* (*al.* ⲛ̅ⲥⲁⲓⲏ), εν ισχυρα φωνη AP *etc.* (ℵ omits εν with *Prim* and minority *latt* [see above on xvii. 16]) but none have κραυγη or other word at this place. "In fortitudine" *Aug*$^{anon}$ *vg.*

*ibid.* — λεγων *copt* (which substitutes ⲭⲉ). So P 114 *syr* S but not ℵ. Here however ℵ is replaced by 114, its 'alter ego' in some respects (as 119–123 in other respects).

*ibid.* "Fell Babylon the great city" *copt.* No Greeks Latins or Syr add *city* here [*sah* is wanting]. *All* Horner's coptic MSS. add ⲧ̅ⲙⲁⲕⲓ but one, and that one adds ⲧ̅ⲙⲡⲟⲗⲓⲥ.

*ibid.* + των (*ante* δαιμονων) *copt* but only Gr. 31.

*ibid.* *Copt* has *both* unclean clauses with *text. rec.* and ℵ (against AP *etc.*), and does *not* add (or substitute) the third clause as to every unclean *beast* as do A 34–35 *gig* here.

3. εκ του θυμου του οινου *copt* for εκ του οινου του θυμου with P *etc. gig* against ℵ, and against A which omits του οινου, and *syr* S, which omits του θυμου.

*ibid.* *Copt* adds "all" after οἱ βασιλεις, as often, but has no support.

*ibid.* *Copt* says "they who committed fornication with her." *Cf.* + οἱ (*ante* μετ αυτης) by 16–69–102 and πορνευσαντες 16–39–69–102.

*ibid.* — της δυναμεως *copt* is agreed to by 59, who has sympathised often previously.

*ibid.* *Prim Aug*$^{anon}$ and *gig* give *mercatores* for οι εμποροι. So *copt* ⲛⲓϣϣⲟϯ. So also xviii. 11.

*ibid.* For στρηνους or στρηνου (deliciarum *gig*) *copt* gives ⲡⲉⲥϫⲉⲣϫⲉⲣ deliciae, luxuriae.

4. *Copt* omits αλλην with Gr. 104 only and *arm.* Some *copt* MSS. omit κοινωνησητε ταις αμαρτιαις αυτης και without support.

5. *Copt* MSS. are divided between ⲁⲩⲧⲟⲙⲟⲩ (joined) and ⲁⲩⲫⲟⲥ (reached) for ηκολουθησαν or εκολληθησαν.

xviii. 6. — υμιν *copt* and ℵCAP and some cursives and *syr* S *Hipp* and some Latins.

*ibid.* — και (*ante* διπλωσατε) part of the coptic MSS. and only ℵ 23 of Greeks.

*ibid.* Omit κατα 35–87 but *not copt.*

*ibid.* + αυτης (*post* ποτηριω) *copt* and so ℵB and a good number of cursives including 35–87 40 56 114.

*ibid.* For ὦ εκερασε *copt* has ὡς εκερ. So 35–87 with 38, and 78 (one of a sevenfold group). A few others write ὃ for ὦ and 102* : ἓν τὸ αὐτης ὃ for εν τω ποτηριω ὦ.

*ibid.* For κερασατε αυτη διπλουν *copt* has "double it to her." Gr 84* omits κερασατε.

7. There has been some confusion here but it has not affected ℵ (see my collation of the MSS.). *Copt* says "*The glory in which she was with the luxury*," for οσα εδοξασεν εαυτην και εστρηνιασε. *Gig* and *vg* are near: *Quantum glorificauit se et in deliciis fuit.*

*ibid.* *Copt* omits τοσουτον, saying "give it to her of grief and mourning."

*ibid.* "that I will sit" *copt* for καθημαι. *Cf.* οτι καθιω of 14–92, 22** and B here.

*ibid.* "*being* a queen." Some Gr cursives have + ως before βασιλισσα as 46–88–101 97, some with καθως as 23–55 56, and a few thus: οτι ειμι καθως for καθημαι, bringing in the ειμι. *Sum* having no present participle no Latins can agree with *copt*, but *Prim* equates with "quia regina sum" and *Cypr* "regina sum."

8. και καυθησεται εν τω πυρι So *copt* order against all Latins and Greeks και εν πυρι κατακαυθησεται, while *copt* adds the strong article to πυρι without Greek support.

*ibid.* "The Lord God" *Copt* and *Gr Lat* is opposed here by ℵ with ο θεος ο κυριος.

*ibid.* For κρινων or κρινας *copt* has ⲉⲧⲁⲥϥⲥⲁⲡ. Compare Latin *qui judicabit* and *qui judicat.*

9. — αυτην *copt* with ℵACB and nearly all cursives.

*Copt* begins a new sentence at οταν, substituting "But if," that is to say some coptic MSS. add ⲁⲉ (all have ⲉϣⲱⲡ = *si* or οταν). This is not agreed to by Greek, Syr or Lat.

*ibid.* ℵ alone substitutes ιδωσιν for βλεπωσιν. *Copt* is

ⲁⲩⲱⲁⲛⲛⲁⲩ. There may be a connection. *Copt* uses several words for *videre*, and ⲥⲟⲩⲥ is the stronger term for βλεπειν perhaps, or ⲭⲟⲩⲱⲧ.

xviii. 10. "That woe to her, woe to her" *copt* for ουαι ουαι. No others. As I have said before, in such things ℵ and A are careful not to follow. Therefore the other agreement is the more interesting, sidewise, and important.

*ibid.* The order η μεγαλη πολις βαβυλων *copt* for η πολις η μεγαλη βαβ. is not found in the Greeks I have examined.

*ibid.* 'luxurious' (ⲉⲧⲭⲉⲣⲭⲉⲣ) *copt* for ἡ ισχυρα has no counterpart in Gr Lat or Syr, the only variation played on ισχυρα by the Greeks being οχυρα by a small group 21–73–79–80–100–103, while the Latins do not vary from *fortis* [*sah* still missing].

*ibid.* *Copt* says "in one hour came her fall," for οτι εν μια ωρα ηλθεν η κρισις σου, omitting οτι, retaining εν (dropped by ℵCABP and most cursives with *syr* and *latin*), and substituting *fall* (ⲛ̄ⲭⲉⲡⲉⲥⲯⲁⲡ) for κρισις. That is, Horner's text; but is not ⲯⲁⲡ intended for *judicium?* No others vary from κρισις [ⲡⲉⲥⲯⲁⲡ most coptic MSS.; four of them ⲡⲉⲥⲯⲉⲓ].

11. Again ⲙⲓⲱⲟϯ (mercatores) for οι εμποροι here. See xviii. 3. Here mercatores *Prim* and *gig*, negotiatores *vg*.

*ibid.* "Shall weep, they shall mourn" *copt.* — και *sec.* No Greeks, but — και πενθουσιν a group of cursives. Note however *Prim* alone *flebunt plangentes eam.*

*ibid.* — ουκετι *copt*, no Greeks.

12. *Copt* says "*their* freight of gold, with *their* freight of silver." No Greeks nor Latins.

*ibid.* "*with the precious stones*" for και λιθου τιμιου. So CP 114 λιθους τιμιους and λιθων τιμιων *syr* and *Prim* [*non gig* = lapidis preciosi *ut vg*].

*ibid.* *Copt* continues ⲛⲉⲙ ⲙⲓⲙⲁⲣⲅⲁⲣⲓⲧⲏⲥ "*with the* pearls." So A, observe, μαργαριταις exactly with *copt*, involving the dative, while ℵ [which did not share the plural above of λιθους τιμιους or λιθων τιμιων (γομον understood)], with 35–87 59 and 95, writes μαργαριτων in the plural with *syr* S and Σ, and *gig Prim* here "margaritarum."

*ibid.* βυσσινων ℵ, alone. This should be decisive. *Copt* MSS. ADHZ = ⲙⲓⲱⲉⲛⲥ clearly plural. All other

Greeks, including ACPB = βυσσινου as *Lat. Coptic* $T^tG^cT$ = ⲡⲓϣⲉⲛⲥ, *al.* ϣⲉⲛⲥ.

xviii. 12. — και παν ξυλον θυινον *copt* here. So Gr 69 only. $A^{gr}$ substitutes σκευος for ξυλον in this phrase (alone). As the coptic was missing here, the σκευος following *in coptic* would at once attract his eye, for the coptic uses the same word as the Greek in the next clause: ⲛⲉⲗⲗ ⲥⲕⲉⲩⲟⲥ ⲛⲓⲃⲉⲛ ⲛ̄ⲉⲗⲉⲫⲁⲛⲧⲓⲛⲟⲛ, which in coptic *takes the place of* the missing phrase και παν ξυλον θυινον, which coptic *replaces* after ⲉⲗⲉⲫⲁⲛⲧⲓⲛⲟⲛ, writing *there* + ⲛⲉⲗⲗ ϣⲉ ⲛⲓⲃⲉⲛ ⲛ̄ⲑⲩⲓⲛⲟⲛ.

12 *fin.* *Copt* has και μαρμαρου. ℵ omits with 1 57 *Er Ald Col.*

13. και οινον is present in *copt* as in ℵCAP. B and most cursives omit (possibly owing to an old change of order).

*ibid.* For και σεμιδαλιν και σιτον *copt* has "with symedalion *of* wheat." *Cf.* σιτου 39 and συτου by our old friend 69 of the same graeco-latin family.

*ibid.* 35–87 vary the order to σεμιδαλιν και οινον και ελαιον without other authority.

*ibid.* After "horse" *sah* (which begins again at και οινον) has an ornate gloss with *Prim*, but not *copt*, which omits και ρεδων altogether, continuing after "horse": *with body with soul of man.* The Greeks and Latins do not use the singular, and *Prim* omits with *sah.*

14. While 35–87 *syr* S add σου after οπωρα, *copt* drops it after ψυχη (ⲛⲧⲉ ⲧⲉⲡⲓⲑⲩⲙⲓⲁ | ⲛ̄ⲧⲉ ⲧⲯⲩⲭⲏ; but *sah* says ⲛ̄ⲧⲉ ⲡⲓⲑⲩⲙⲓⲁ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲩⲯⲩⲭⲏ).

*ibid.* απηλθον *copt* = 40 50 57 102 *Er. Col.*

*ibid.* ℵ* writes ριπαρα for λιπαρα. We do not attribute this to any coptic influence, merely pointing out that ρ occurs in the *copt:* ⲛⲉⲗⲗ ⲛⲉⲕⲉⲛⲓ ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ. So ℵ drops τα *sec.*, with C 36 40 59 106 119. *Copt* is ⲛⲉⲗⲗ ⲛⲉⲫⲓⲣⲓ (*cf. sah*).

*ibid.* [απηλθεν *sec. text. rec.*] = απωλετο most Greeks, but απωλοντο ℵ and fourteen cursives and *gig Prim latt* "perierunt" with *copt* and *sah* ⲁⲩⲧⲁⲕⲟ. Here we cannot distinguish between Latin and Coptic influence on ℵ. Gwynn renders απηλθεν for *syr*, but $syr^{sch}$ *perierunt.*

14/15. *Copt* runs these two together thus: "and thy merchants shall not find them any more because *these are they who* became rich from thee," not agreeing with *sah*, nor with

the run of Greek Latin and Syr witnesses. Some Gr. cursives join οι εμποροι however to ver. 14 with *syr*$^{s}$ S, namely 35–87 36 51–90 and possibly others which I have not noted.

xviii. 15. For κλαιοντες και πενθουντες *copt* (most MSS.) says "they shall weep, they shall mourn." Only one Gr. MS. omits και (98) and *sah* has it.

16. — και *init.* ℵCAB *etc.* Agrees with *copt sah* and *gig.*

*ibid.* *Copt* says "woe to thee, woe to thee," not *sah* = woe woe.

*ibid.* Order: η μεγαλη πολις of 38 only = *coptic.*

*ibid.* *Copt*: ⲙⲡⲓⲱⲉⲛⲥ "fine linen" with the article has no agreement among Greeks, nor has "*the* purple and *the* scarlet." The exceptional order of A$^{gr}$ κοκκινον και πορφυρουν και βυσσινον has no coptic support nor other attestation.

*ibid.* — και (*ante* κεχρυσωμενη) *Coptic* some cursives (principally the syriac group) and *syr* S.

*ibid.* μαργαριτη (*pro* μαργαριταις) by ℵCAP 95 (no others) = *coptic* with all coptic MSS. (but one ⲛⲓ) which write the article singular ⲛⲉⲙ ⲡⲙⲁⲣⲅⲁⲣⲓⲧⲏⲥ, while Goussen's *sah* merely ϩⲓ ⲙⲁⲣⲅⲁⲣⲓⲧⲏⲥ. So that this singular really seems to come from *copt* to ℵCAP 95 and not from *sah.* *Prim* alone of Latins apparently gives *margarita.*

17. "And every pilot *of the sea* with everyone who saileth on the sea." Thus *copt*, = ⲟⲩⲟϩ ⲣⲉⲫⲉⲣϩⲉⲙⲙⲓ ⲛⲓⲃⲉⲛ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉ ϕⲓⲟⲙ ⲛⲉⲙ ⲟⲩⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲃⲉⲛ ⲉⲧⲉⲣϩⲱⲧ ϩⲉⲛ ϕⲓⲟⲙ. The addition "of the sea" appears unique with *aeth* and the omission of και ναυται και οσοι την θαλασσαν εργαζονται. *Sah* is rather different: ⲁⲩⲱ ⲣⲉⲫⲣϩⲙⲙⲉ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲛ̄ⲙ ⲛⲉⲧⲥⲟⲃϩ ϩⲛ̄ ⲛⲓⲉⲣⲱⲟⲩ ⲛ̄ⲙ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲉϥ ⲛ̄ⲙ ⲛⲉⲧⲣ̄ϩⲱⲃ' ϩⲛ̄ ⲑⲁⲗⲁⲥⲥⲁ.

18. *Copt* (*sah* now wanting again until xix. 6) adds ταυτη with C 104 and *latt*, but inverts the order (as usual in this phrase): ταυτη τη μεγαλη πολει.

19. For εβαλον *copt* says ⲁⲩⲧⲁⲗⲉ. 53 writes ελαβον but this has probably no connection.

*ibid.* For χουν *copt* says ⲕⲁϩⲓ. Only 69 substitutes a word = κονιορτον.

xviii. 19. "Upon their head" says *copt* for επι τας κεφαλας αυτων. Thus only ℵ 59 επι της κεφαλης αυτων = *copt* ⲉϫⲉⲛ ⲧⲟⲩⲁϥⲉ.

*ibid.* κραζοντες *pro* και εκραζον *copt.* No others.

*ibid.* ουαι *semel* with ℵ and fifteen cursives, including 40 and 95. So *copt*, but as usual adding 'to her': ⲟⲩⲟⲓ ⲛⲁⲥ.

*ibid.* η μεγαλη πολις *copt* in this order as usual. No Greeks.

*ibid.* — παντες *syr* S and *copt.* *Copt* says "they from whom were made rich whose ships are in the sea," repeating again "*having been made rich* from her preciousness."

20. *Copt* order is "Delight thee, Heaven, over her," with support of *Anonym* here: "exsulta coelum super eam." No Greeks.

*ibid.* *Copt* says "with the saints *all*, with the apostles, with the prophets." No others add "all," but 56 amplifies, *adding* και παντες οι αγιοι after προφηται.

και οι before αποστολοι is added by nearly all.

*ibid.* "The Lord God" *copt* for ο Θεος. No others.

21. *Copt* introduces something novel here: "*and a strong angel cried out a great sound*, and he took away a great millstone . . ." No others agree. ℵA omit ισχυρος as an attribute of αγγελος and ℵ* adds ισχυρον after λιθον and writes ως λιθον for ως μυλον. There must have been something to bother him here; *Copt* is simply ⲟⲩⲟⲩ ⲁϥⲉϩ ⲟⲩⲛⲓⲱⲧ ⲛ̄ⲱⲛⲓ ⲙ̄ⲙⲏⲭⲁⲛⲏ.

*ibid.* — και *ante* εβαλεν *copt.*

*ibid.* Here ℵ rushes in with *copt* to add οτι before ουτως. Only 16–39–69 and 102 support ℵ. But while ℵ shows us this coptic ϫⲉ, he does not follow in a peculiar construction and an addition by *copt*, which writes: "saying that thus in a fall will fall Babylon. *And she will be thrown down to the great lake;* and the great city shall not be found any more." Tischendorf does not record this + οτι for ℵ in his notes in ed. viii.

22. — και *init.* ℵ and 1 only. *Copt* introduces with ⲟⲩⲁⲉ.

*Copt* shortens και φωνη κιθ. και μουσ. και αυλ. και σαλπιστων to ⲟⲩⲁⲉ ⲧⲥⲙⲏ ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲟⲩⲱⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲙ ⲟⲩⲣⲉϥϫⲱ ⲛⲉⲙ ⲟⲩⲥⲁⲗⲡⲓⲅⲝ. Note that ℵ 35–87 90 write σαλπιγγων for σαλπιστων, *Hipp* σαλπιγκτων and *syr* S σαλπιγγος = *copt.*

xviii. 22. — πασης τεχνης ℵA and *copt* [*hiat sah*]. (No cursives, nor Latin). This place is very important. See specimen pages of collations printed herewith. It occurs in such a way as to merit the most serious attention.

*ibid.* On the other hand ℵ and twenty cursives omit και φωνη μυλου to the end of the verse. Not so *copt.* But this is a mere error of ℵ (from homoioteleuton) as some of the twenty cursives' sisters have it; just as at:

23. A omits και φως λυχνου *etc.*, which *coptic* retains, like ℵ and most.

*ibid.* *Copt* begins this verse also ⲟⲩⲁⲉ for και, and repeats ⲟⲩⲁⲉ for the second και. Note 38 with ἡ for και *sec.*

*ibid.* $C^{gr}$ 19 and *syr* S prefix φωνη to νυμφης. Not so *copt.*

*ibid.* εν ταις φαρμακειαις *plural* by *syr* S and *Latins* is supported by *coptic* but not by a single Greek.

24. [αιμα of *text. rec.*], opposed by B and eighty cursives with αιματα, is found in *copt:* ⲡⲥⲛⲟϥ with ℵCAP 18 36 38 56 21–73–79–80*txt*–100 *syr latt,* while 34–35–87 go with the mass, as also the good cursives 114 119–123.

*ibid.* + των *ante* προφητων *Hippol* (no Gk MSS.) } is supported
+ των ,, αγιων 19 } by *copt.*

xix. 1. — και *init.* ℵCABP and most = *copt,* opposed only by *syr* and a few cursives of syriac strain.

*ibid.* + ως (*ante* φωνην) is in the same case.

*ibid.* *Copt* says μεγαλην κραυγην οχλου πολλου bringing μεγαλην immediately after ὡς. The Greeks are content to place μεγαλην after φωνην (except cursive 1 and seventeen others which omit μεγαλην).

*ibid.* + το (*ante* αλληλουια) 1 80 57 *Er Ald Col. Cf. copt* + ⲉ introductory.

*ibid.* ℵ* omits και η δοξα και η τιμη. Not so *copt.*

*ibid.* του θεου ημων for κυριω τω θεω ημων ℵCABP and most, are supported by *copt* and *gig* (not by *Prim vg* nor *Anon*).

2. — και δικαιαι *copt,* without support [Horner places this clause at the end of verse 1], but *copt* supplies this immediately afterwards by amplifying the next clause thus: "and in a righteous judgment he judged the great harlot." No others thus.

xix. 2. But *copt* omits the clause : ητις εφθειρε την γην εν τη πορνεια αυτης. Only 59–67 81* 114 omit part of it, namely ητις εφθειρε την γην. *Coptic* MS. A refers to it as present in *sah*, but a gloss. Apparently $A^{gr}$ consulted another MS. here for he has it, but, with cursive number 9 alone, writes εκρινεν for εφθειρε here, showing something lurking beneath the surface.

*ibid.* Horner's English text ends verse 2 : "and he took (the) vengeance of (the) blood of his servants *from her*," eliding χειρος, but no Gk MSS. do this, and the coptic is ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲓⲧⲟⲧⲥ.

3 *init.* ⲟⲩⲟϩ ϥⲱⲁϩⲃ̄ ⲁⲥϫⲟⲥ. ειρηκ̲εν, *ut vid.*, read by B and a number of cursives.

For δευτερον ειρηκαν : 35–87 read εκ δευτερου ειρηκαν (34 εκ δευτερου ειρηκασιν).

But C = ειπαν and 38 ειπον = nearer coptic ⲁⲥϫⲟⲥ in form if not in number.

*ibid.* + το (*ante* αλληλουια) 23 *Cf. copt* + ⲭⲉ.

*ibid.* "Shall go up" *copt* for αναβαινει. *Cf.* ανεβαινεν 35–87 38 and ανεβη 21–73–79–80–100–103, 50 *syr* S.

4. — ζωα $\aleph^{gr}$ but only one coptic MS. $C^{*copt}$. This is however quite curious. Mr. Horner can help us by an examination of $C^{copt}$ separately for the ℵ base [see on xx. 14].

*ibid.* + ⲭⲉ introductory *copt* before αμην αλληλουια, but alone. No Greeks so far examined add το before αμην here.

5. Here comes an interesting place, for although *sah* (*ed. Goussen*) only begins verse 6, we have a coptic gloss giving the sahidic reading which agrees with ℵ*, while $\aleph^{a}$ goes with coptic, maintaining *copt* and *sah* order against all Greeks and Latins (*except Prim* : "et vox exivit," but he says "de caelo" with B 14–92 103). ℵ* says και φωναι εξηλθον εκ του θρονου λεγουσαι. See Horner's arabic note : "*Sah.* and there went out voices." $\aleph^{a}$ corrects to και φωνη εξηλθεν εκ του θρονου λεγουσα, which agrees exactly with *coptic* against all Gk MSS. = και φωνη εκ (or απο CAB *etc.*) του θρονου εξηλθε λεγουσα.

*ibid.* — και *sec.* ℵCP and one *coptic* MS. B. The rest have ⲛⲉⲙ.

*ibid.* — και *tert.* ℵCABP and most is agreed to by *copt.*

The coptic says "the small with (ⲛⲉⲗⲗ) the great." So *syr* S (as at xi. 18) *οι μικροι μετα των μεγαλων.*

xix. 6. *Copt* adds "great" before voice. No Greeks.

*ibid.* — *ως tert.* some of the *coptic* MSS. which say ⲛⲉⲗⲗ ⲧⲥⲗⲏ, not as above ⲛⲉⲗⲗ ⲙ̅ⲫⲣⲏ† ⲛ̅ⲧⲥⲗⲏ, but all Greeks have the third ως.

*ibid.* + introductory ⲭⲉ before αλληλουια *copt*, but no Greeks add το here.

*ibid.* ℵ* writes ο ⲑ̅ⲥ̅ ο ⲕ̅ⲥ̅ for *κυριος ο θεος*. Not so *copt* = ⲡ̅ⲭⲉⲡⲟ̅ⲥ̅ ⲫ†. *Sah* is wanting. But *sah* begins again: ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲡⲡⲁⲛⲧⲱⲕⲣⲁⲧⲱⲣ; ℵBP and most add *ημων*.

7. *Copt* writes "glorify him" for *δωμεν την δοξαν αυτω*. The Greeks do not write *αυτον*, but ℵ* 102 say *αυτων*, and 35–[*non* 34]–87 97* 106 omit *την* before *δοξαν*.

*ibid.* *η νυμφη pro η γυνη* ℵ^c alone. So *sah* and *copt* ϣⲉⲗⲉⲧ and the Latins, some *uxor*, some *sponsa* as *gig*. ℵ^c was in the habit of accommodating to his Latin, and probably followed it here, although we see that both *copt* and *sah* already had it when ℵ* was copying. He avoided changing his Greek because *ἡ γυνη* followed by *αυτου* could mean nothing else than *uxor*. The coptic adds this *αυτου*, ⲧⲉⲫϣⲉⲗⲉⲧ, as the Latins "sponsa ejus," "uxor ejus."

*ibid.* For *ητοιμασεν εαυτην* *copt* prefers "was prepared for him" ⲉⲧⲁⲩⲥⲉⲃⲧⲱⲧⲥ ⲛⲁϥ, while *sah* differs. In fact *copt* couples the clauses thus ⲭⲉ ⲁϥⲓ ⲛ̅ⲭⲉⲡⲓϩⲟⲡ ⲛ̅ⲧⲉ ⲡⲓϩⲓⲏⲃ ⲛⲉⲗⲗ ⲧⲉⲫϣⲉⲗⲉⲧ ⲉⲧⲁⲩⲥⲉⲃⲧⲱⲧⲥ ⲛⲁϥ, while *sah* gives: ⲭⲉ ⲁϥⲉⲓ ⲛ̅ⲑⲓ̅ ⲡⲧⲁⲗⲗⲟⲥ ⲙ̅ⲡⲉϩⲓⲉⲓⲃ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲧⲉⲫϣⲉⲗⲉⲉⲧ ⲁⲥⲥⲟⲃⲧⲉ ⲙ̅ⲙⲟⲥ.

8. *Gig* says "ut *operiret se* byssinum," *vg* "ut *cooperiat se*." So *copt* (and *sah*): ϩⲓⲛⲁ ⲛ̅ⲧⲉⲥ† ϩⲓⲱⲧⲥ ⲛ̅ⲟⲩϣⲉⲛⲥ.

*ibid.* Textus receptus is *καθαρον και λαμπρον*. B and most cursives make this *λαμπρον και καθαρον*, but ℵAP 7–39–45 91 95 102 with *gig* (and *am lux* 'splendens candidum') elide *και*, writing *λαμπρον καθαρον* and *splendidum mundum* (*male Belsh.* splendens *teste Karlsson*) *exactly as copt* ⲉϥϕⲟⲣⲓ ⲉϥⲟⲩⲁⲃ [*sah* seems to conflate here] but for *καθαρον* and *candidum* the coptic word is more forcible still = *pure*.

9. — *του γαμου* by ℵ*P 1–46=88=101–59–67, 16–39–102,

21–73–79–80–81–100–103, 36 106 114 *Er Ald Col* 57 *gig* [but not other Latins] is agreed to by *copt* but *not* by *sah.* This is a place where, I think, we may fairly claim that it is *boh* and not *sah* which was before ℵ.

(The *syr* S writes της διακονιας for του γαμου in error.) The omission may be due to indistinctness in a very ancient graeco-syr, but as *gig* omits without the other Latins it carries him back far, especially as ℵ[a] with his Latin before him did not recognise the omission but adds του γαμου.

xix. 9. ℵ* omits και λεγει μοι *sec.* (supplied by ℵ[a]). 6 11 ? 36 38 98 also omit, but not *copt.* *Sah* merely says ⲡⲉϫⲁϥ omitting και and μοι.

10. *Copt* says "and I fell before his feet, I worshipped him" (so *sah*) for "και επεσον (επεσα ℵAP *etc.*) εμπροσθεν των ποδων αυτου προσκυνησαι αυτω." So P 21–73–79–80–100, 59–67, 114 *syr* S και προσεκυνησα. For αυτω B with latins writes αυτον, but not the rest.

*ibid.* After ορα μη (ϫⲉ ⲙ̄ⲫⲱⲣ) *copt* supplies ϫⲉ before συνδουλος σου ειμι, but not the Greeks; 36 supplies εγω as *copt* and *sah.*

*ibid.* — σου *sec.* ℵ* 6 103. Not so *copt* or *sah.*

*ibid.* "Worship God" (in this order) *copt* and *sah* without Greek or Latin support for τω θεω προσκυνησον.

*ibid. fin.* αληθειας for προφητειας *copt* [*non sah*] with only Greek 80**txt.* 80 however writes in the margin Γ[ρ] και προφητειας Therefore he intends either αληθειας και προφητειας or (as *gig*) "spiritus est *et* prophetiae."

11. *Copt* adds *init.* "(and) after these things." No Greek support, nor *sah.*

*ibid.* ⲁⲓⲛⲁϥ, "I saw," for ιδου writes *copt*, but not *sah* (= ⲉⲓⲥ, ιδον) nor others. (Here *copt* probably mistook the greek ιδου for ιδον, and all coptic MSS. faithfully followed the original error.)

*ibid.* — καλουμενος AP and twenty-eight cursives *Hipp*; is not omitted by *copt sah* nor *syr* nor *latin.*

*ibid.* *Copt* says "*the* faithful and *the* true." Greeks do not supply the articles.

*ibid.* For και εν δικαιοσυνη κρινει και πολεμει *copt* writes "and he gave (the) judgment in righteousness," eliding και

πολεμει. No Greeks, nor do they change the order. *Sah* transfers εν δικαιοσυνη to the end of the verse, but has the πολεμει.

xix. 12. *Coptic* with *Prim* and *Cypr* supply *erant* before ως φλοξ but no Greeks supply a verb nor other Latins.

*ibid.* ℵBP and many cursives with *Hipp* omit ως. *Coptic* uses ⲟⲛⲓ ⲡⲉ ⲡⲟⲩⲱⲁϩ ⲛ̄ⲭⲣⲱⲙ instead of the usual ⲙ̄ⲫⲣⲏ†.

*ibid. fin.* 59 adds μονος. *Cf. copt*: ⲉⲃⲏⲗ ⲛ̄ⲑⲟϥ ⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲩⲁⲧϥ.

13 *init.* — και Some *copt* and *sah* (not Greek).

*ibid.* περιρεραμμενον ℵ*, περιρεραντισμενον ℵ^c, ρεραντισμενον P 36, ερραντισμενον 35–[*non* 34]–87 95 109(*gr et arm*) *Hipp*, εραντισμενον 32. Compare *copt:* ⲉϥⲛⲟϫϩ or ⲉϥⲛⲟⲩϫϩ *et latt* (*sah* ⲉϥϫⲏϭ = *tinctum vel coloratum*). *Sah* seems therefore not to have influenced ℵ at all here.

*ibid.* + εν (*ante* αιματι) *syr* S *copt* and *sah* with the cursives 4–20–48–64–74, 6–31–106 32 34 [*non* 35–87] 109 (*gr arm*).

*ibid.* — το ονομα αυτου *Copt.* No Greeks. *Copt* says "and *being called* (the) word of God."

Only ℵ* varies καλειται or κεκληται, writing κεκλητο for καλειται το, but this is somewhat significant it would seem. Only *gr* 100 with Latin omits the article before λογος. *Copt* used the weak and not the strong article.

14. το στρατευμα (ⲡⲓⲥⲧⲣⲁⲧⲉⲩⲙⲁ) two *coptic* MSS. say, but no Greeks vary the plural. *Sah* (*Goussen*) says ⲛⲉⲥⲧⲣⲁ-ⲧⲉⲩⲙⲁ but Balestri ⲛⲉϥⲥⲧⲣⲁⲧⲉⲩⲙⲁ. But *gig Hier Vigil Taps* and *Anon* 1/2 say "exercitus sequebatur."

*ibid.* — εν τω ουρανω *copt* [*non sah*].

*ibid.* For "ενδεδυμενοι (ενδεδυμενοις ℵ*) βυσσινον λευκον και καθαρον" *copt* has (Horner text with eight MSS.) ⲉⲟⲩⲟⲛ ϩⲁⲛϣⲉⲛⲥ ⲉⲩϕⲟⲣⲓ ⲧⲟⲓ ϩⲓⲱⲧⲟⲩ; *Gig* has *purpureum*, and the cursives 18 80 have λαμπρον for λευκον; *Hier in Esai* "mundissimo" (λευκοβυσσινον 95). (Horner's CD* G^mgHZ have ϩⲁⲛϩⲃⲱⲥ, and T ϩⲁⲛϩⲃⲱⲥ ⲛ̄ϣⲉⲛⲥ.)

15. Contrary to custom *copt* does not supply παντα after εθνη, which 38 97 and *gig* do here with *sah.*

*ibid.* — του θυμου και some *copt* MSS.

16. — επι *sec.* ℵ 12 62=63–72 33 ? and *copt sah Vigil Taps.*

*ibid. Copt* supplies the article before *kings* and *lords*, writing

βασιλευς των βασιλεων και (ὁ) κυριος των κυριων. No Greeks so far.

xix. 17. αλλον αγγελον for ενα αγγελον ℵ 36 *syr* S; also note ενα αλλον αγγελον 34–35–87. Note *copt* and *sah* ⲉⲕⲉⲁⲅⲅⲉⲗⲟⲥ. This seems pretty conclusive for the whole group ℵ 34–35–87 *syr* S. Note the correctors of ℵ have not changed. And ⲉⲕⲉ implies plain αλλος or εις αλλος. The group varied in interpretation, but all hang absolutely together.

*ibid.* — τω (*ante* ηλιω) *copt* and *sah* = Latin. No Greeks, except "the Angel's" copy (Vergecius) No. 57 = *Col*, and *Er* 1 2 3 *Aldus* [but not Apoc 1].

*ibid.* *Copt* says ⲉⲫⲱϣ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ (as *sah* ⲉⲫⲁϣⲕⲁⲕ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ).

*ibid.* + εν (*ante* φωνη) ℵB and forty-three cursives and *syr* S with *copt sah*.

*ibid.* After λεγων instead of the dative πασι τοις ορνεοις κ.τ.λ. the *coptic* introduces the phrase with ⲭⲉ. "All the birds which fly in midst of Heaven come, assemble . . ."

*ibid.* This — και *tert.* is witnessed to by the Latin *gig* and *Anonym* but not by Greeks. A few (1 46–88–101 59 67 80 81 114, that is the 1 family) omit και συναγεσθε with *Prim.*

*ibid.* *Copt* continues . . . "in the great supper (this order ϩⲉⲛ ⲡⲓⲙⲓϣϯ ⲛ̅ⲁⲓⲡⲛⲟⲩ) of the Lord God." The "great supper" rather than "of the great God" agrees with most Greeks. Most Greeks supply του before θεου but none add κυριου.

18. *Copt* (*sah* partly mutilated) supplies τας before σαρκας throughout without Greek support (except in the fifth place, where 22 29–30–98 47 51–90 add it) and omits παντων with 1–62=3–72 119–123 *syr* S. It also adds the strong article των before βασιλεων and before all the nouns without Greek support (except 4–48–64 + των once before ελευθερων, and with ℵ 56 95 before μεγαλων).

19. (Note κατα for και *tert.* by ℵ*. The usual ⲙⲉⲣⲓ is used here by *copt*, but preceding ⲡⲟⲩⲥⲧⲣⲁⲧⲉⲩⲙⲁ might be confounded with μετα or κατα).

*ibid.* *Copt* gives the attribute *white* to the horse, but no Greeks.

xix. 19. For *και μετα* in the last place *copt* merely uses ⲛⲉⲗⲗ. See remarks above as to *κατα* by ℵ*.

20. [*μετα τουτου ο ψευδοπρ.* common text]. BP and most cursives give *ο μετ αυτου ψευδοπρ.*, but ℵ 10–17–37–77–91–96, 21–73–79–100–103, 36, 62=63–72, 119–123 *syr* S = *μετ αυτου* for *μετα τουτου*, while A 32 41 = *οι μετ αυτου* more definite still = *copt* "those *who* (ⲛⲏ) were with him"; *copt* continues ⲛⲉⲗⲗ ⲡⲓⲯⲉⲩⲇⲟⲡⲣⲟⲫⲏⲧⲏⲥ, while *sah* brings this earlier, writing: ⲁⲩⲱ ⲁⲩⲃⲱⲡ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲑⲏⲣⲓⲟⲛ ⲛ̄ⲗⲗ ⲡⲉⲡⲣⲟⲫⲏⲧⲏⲥ ⲛ̄ ⲛⲟⲩⲍ ⲉⲧⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲩ.

*ibid.* *Copt* says "who did the signs among them before him," carrying *εν οις* back from before *επλανησε*; not so *sah*. *Copt* continues "Having bound them who received." (For some reason 44–52–82 substitute *πλανωντας* for *λαβοντας*).

*ibid.* For *τη εικονι*, ℵ* 38 61 write *την εικονα* with *gig* and *latt* ymaginem; *copt* and *sah* have ⲛⲉⲗⲗ ⲛⲏ ⲉⲑⲟⲩⲱϣⲧ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉϥϩⲩⲕⲱⲛ. [For *τη εικονι* B substitutes *το χαραγμα* following *Prim*, who gives *imaginem . . . caragma*.]

*ibid.* *Copt* inverts the order thus: "they cast them down both alive," supplying *κατω* (ⲉϧⲣⲏⲓ) after *εβληθησαν*. No Greeks nor Latins. (In *syr* S there is a slight muddle, see Gwynn.)

*ibid.* ℵ writes *της κεομενης* and AP 67 81 *της καιομενης* for *την καιομενην* = *Latt* (as *Veles*: *του καιομενου*). *Cf.* *copt.* ⲉⲧϩⲩⲙⲛⲏ ⲉⲑⲙⲟϩ ⲛ̄ϫⲣⲱⲙ.

*ibid.* *Copt* ends ⲛⲉⲗⲗ ⲑⲏⲛ and *sah* ϩⲛ̄ ⲟⲩⲑⲏⲛ.

*τω* is elided before *θειω* by ℵAPB and sixty cursives with *Latt*. *Syr* S writes *και* for *εν τω* with *copt* ⲛⲉⲗⲗ.

21. + *αυτου post ρομφαια*. So 95 *gig* and *copt sah*.

*ibid.* *Only* 59 changes the order of the last clause to *και τα ορνεα εχορτασθησαν παντα* . . . . while *copt* says *και τα ορνεα παντα του ουρανου εχορτασθησαν εκ εν των σαρκων αυτων*. + *του ουρανου* by *copt* stands alone, and uncountenanced by *sah* [order of the rest *και παντα τα ορνεα εχορ. εκ των σαρκων αυτων*]. 59 with 87 substitute *αυτου* for *αυτων* alone. As 59 alone changes the order with *copt* (and has other coptic affiliations) this substitution with Egyptian 87 looks as if he probably saw the *copt* ⲛⲟⲩⲥⲁⲣϫ.

xix. 21. 74 alone substitutes ἐρπετὰ for ορνεα. *Copt* is ϩⲁⲗⲁϯ.

xx. 1. This place is interesting as regards ℵ and ℵ* with reference to *bohairic* or *sahidic*, for while ℵ* has "angel" (although he writes αγγε for αγγελον by mistake) with *boh*, ℵ[a] adds αλλον with *sah* and *syr* S against *boh*. *Boh* has ⲉⲟⲩⲁⲅⲅⲉⲗⲟⲥ but *sah* ⲉⲕⲉⲁⲅⲅⲉⲗⲟⲥ = αλλον αγγελον with ℵ[a] 32 *syr* S (16–39–102).

*ibid.* ℵ* omits εκ του ουρανου, evidently in error. Neither *copt* nor *sah* omit.

*ibid.* 106 alone omits την before κλειδα with *latt*. *Copt* has the weak article.

*ibid.* *Copt* and *sah* write μεγαλην αλυσιν for αλυσιν μεγαλην but no Greeks or Latins change the order.

*ibid.* For επι την χειρα αυτου ℵ and 38 alone of Greeks write εν τη χειρι αυτου with *Latins syr* S and Σ and *copt* and *sah* distinctly. A[gr] is absent from this combination here.

2. A[gr] however writes here (with *syr* S *Lachmann Tisch Treg Westcott Hort*) ο οφις ο αρχαιος for τον οφιν τον αρχαιον. *Copt* is ⲡⲓϩⲟϥ ⲡⲓⲁⲣⲭⲉⲟⲥ.

*ibid.* ℵ 44 write ο εστι for ος εστι. *Copt* is ⲉⲧⲉ.

*ibid.* + ὁ (*ante* διαβολος) ℵ with 14 18 21–73–79–100–103 38 56 77 97 106, rather a notable group, = *copt* ⲡⲓⲇⲓⲁⲃⲟⲗⲟⲥ. As this could not come from Latin, we see the interweaving of the versions here, and above in verse 1 (εν τη χειρι) *before* ℵ's time.

*ibid.* ℵAB *etc.* add ὁ before σατανας. *Copt* expresses the "και Σατανας" by ⲡⲉ ⲡⲥⲁⲧⲁⲛⲁⲥ, *sah* merely ⲡⲥⲁⲧⲁⲛⲁⲥ. We can quote them both — και. No Greeks.

2/3. ℵ omits χιλια ετη και εβαλεν αυτον but no others nor Greek. A pure error, it would seem.

3. Here we have confusion again of θαλασσαν for αβυσσον by 30–98. Confusion of sound in coptic and syriac as pointed out above (see under xvii. 8).

*ibid.* — αὐτον *post* εκλεισεν many Greeks; while *copt* writes ⲁϥⲙⲁϣϑⲁⲙ (*sah* ⲁϥϣⲧⲁⲙ) translated by Horner "he shut its mouth."

For επανω αυτου A alone has εμμενως αυτου. *Copt* ⲟⲩⲟϩ ⲁϥⲧⲱϧ ⲥⲁⲡϣⲱⲓ ⲙⲙⲟϥ (*sah* merely ⲁⲩⲱ ⲁϥⲧⲱⲱϧ ⲉⲣⲱϥ).

xx. 3. — ετι *copt sah.* *Cf.* 1–12–46=88=101–59–67 14? 40 80 (81) 114 *Tich Anonym.*

*ibid.* *Syr* S adds παντα to τα εθνη, but not *copt* here.

*ibid.* — και *post* ετη (*ante* μετα ταυτα) ℵAB *etc. syr* S *gig sah* is not supported by *copt* which has the introductory ⲟⲩⲟϩ.

*ibid.* + ετι (*ante* μικρον χρονον) *sah* and *copt*, but no others.

4. *Copt* says "having sat upon them judgment was given to them," eliding και *sec. et tert.* (two MSS. add ⲟⲩⲟϩ before κριμα εδοθη). No others thus. *Sah* omits και *init.* (alone).

*ibid.* For και *quart.* before τας ψυχας *copt* substitutes ⲉⲑⲃⲉ, "because of," "δια," while *sah* adds ⲁⲓⲛⲁⲩ with 56 95 only + ειδον.

*ibid.* For και δια τον λογον *copt* says ⲛⲉⲓ ⲡⲓⲥⲁϫⲓ, but *sah* follows Greek ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲧⲃⲉ ⲡⲱϣϧⲉ. No Greeks elide δια with *copt.* Only 59 omits και δια τον λογον του θεου.

*ibid.* *Copt* has των λογων with 63 alone.

*ibid.* — και *post* θεου ℵ alone; *copt* says ⲛⲉⲓ, but *sah* has ⲁⲩⲱ.

*ibid.* + αυτου *post* χαραγμα 59 only. So *copt sah*; 32 56 and 95 add του θηριου.

*ibid.* — αυτων *prim.* ℵAB and sixty cursives and *gig Cypr Aug Prim* but not *syr* S nor *copt* nor *sah.*

*ibid.* — και *ante* εζησαν *copt* [*non sah*]. No Greeks.

*ibid.* + του (*ante* χριστου) ℵAB and most cursives. *Sah* has the article, and *copt* the weak article.

*ibid.* — τα (*ante* χιλια) ℵA and some cursives, *Latin* and *copt sah syr* S.

5. και οι λοιποι *copt* with some Gk cursives, but οι λοιποι δε *sah.* A$^{gr}$ and *latt* omit δε.

*ibid.* Some (graeco-lat) cursives, 7–16–39–104 add ὁτι before αὑτη ἡ ἀναστασις and *syr* S adds και, but neither *copt* nor *sah* add anything.

*ibid.* For some reason 59–67 read αναπαυσις for αναστασις, but both *copt* and *sah* transliterate the Greek with ⲁⲛⲁⲥⲧⲁⲥⲓⲥ.

6. "Blessed is he and a saint of God" for μακαριος και αγιος says *copt*, but no Greeks or Latins.

*ibid.* "Over these the second death shall not find authority *over him*" (and see Horner's note). Some Gk MSS. επι τουτον for επι τουτων at the beginning (29)–30 21–73–79–

103. 104 *Hipp* (*ut edit.*), and επι τουτου 46–88–101, and επι τουτω 14–92, and επι τουτο 102**, but *sah* closes ⲉⲭⲛ̄ ⲛⲁⲓ.

xx. 6. ℵ alone adds και after ιερεις. *Copt* says ⲛⲥⲁⲛⲟⲩⲏⲃ (while *sah* only ⲟⲩⲏⲏⲃ). There is probably no connection.

*ibid.* + τα (*ante* χιλια) ℵB and fourteen cursives. So *copt* distinctly this time.

7. *Copt* says ⲟⲩⲟⲥ ⲉⲣⲱⲡ for και οταν while *sah* ⲥⲟⲧⲁⲛ ⲁⲉ.

*ibid.* ℵ* adds σε after τελεσθη.

*ibid.* — αυτου *copt* [*non sah*] and no Greeks and Latins.

8. *Copt* adds "the servants with" before τα εθνη. No others. Only ℵ 21–73–79–100–103 *syr* S add παντα. In a common original of some kind there may have been a connection, but the coptic ⲛ̄ⲛⲓⲉⲃⲓⲁⲓⲕ has no great similarity to ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ or ⲛⲓⲗ or ⲟⲩⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲃⲉⲛ. Middle coptic ⲛⲓⲃⲓ would come closest in looks to the word used.

*ibid.* — τα *sec.* (*post* εθνη) ℵ and ten cursives and *syr* S with *copt.* The cursives include 35–87, not 34.

*ibid.* — της γης ℵ* only. *Copt* however plainly ⲛ̄ⲧⲉ ⲡⲕⲁϩⲓ, but *sah* apparently ⲛ̄ⲧⲟⲓⲕⲟⲩⲙⲉⲛⲏ.

*ibid.* — τον (*ante* γωγ) ℵ* only of Greeks (with *Latt* of course) and *coptic* ⲅⲱⲥ plainly, while *sah* has ⲛ̄ⲅⲱⲥ.

*ibid.* — τον (*ante* μαγωγ) ℵ*A and seventeen cursives, Latin (of course) *syr* S and *copt* and *sah.* *Sah*, as printed by *Goussen*, has ⲛⲁⲗ ⲙⲁⲅ[ⲱⲥ] (*Balestri* ⲙ̄ⲛ ⲙⲁⲅⲱⲥ), and *copt* ⲛⲉⲗ ⲁ̄ⲅⲱⲥ (ⲙⲁⲅⲱⲥ only T$^{t}$). ℵ$^{gr}$ has ΜΑΓΩΓ'.

*ibid.* For συναγαγειν αυτους *copt* has ⲉⲩⲉⲑⲟⲩⲱⲧⲟⲩ. ℵ and some cursives and *syr* S *gig* say και συναγαγειν αυτους.

*ibid.* + τον (*ante* πολεμον) ℵAB *etc.* *Copt* ⲉⲡⲓⲡⲟⲗⲉⲙⲟⲥ, *sah* ⲉⲡⲡⲟⲗⲉⲙⲟⲥ.

*ibid.* + αυτων (*post* αριθμος) ℵAB *etc.* So *copt.*

9. [Goussen and Balestri number their sahidic with the Vulgate verses, which vary from the Greek.]

*ibid.* For την ηγαπημενην *copt* substitutes ⲙ̄ⲃⲉⲣⲓ "new." No others. Only Gr 100 substitutes μεγαλην. *Sah* = ⲙ̄ⲙⲉⲣⲓⲧ. Horner's note indicates perhaps confusion

between ⲙ̄ⲃⲉⲣⲓ and ⲙⲉⲛⲣⲓⲧ. ℵ$^{gr}$ does not fall into the trap.

xx. 9. εκ (του) ουρανου απο (του) θεου the order of B and many cursives *gig Aug* (*de civ*) and *Anonym* is that of *copt*, but not of *sah*. ℵ$^{gr}$ is wanting here by omission of 9/10 πυρ . . . λιμνην, while A$^{gr}$ omits απο του θεου with 18 21–73–79–100–103 80 and *Prim.*

*ibid.* — και *ult.* (*ante* κατεφαγεν) *copt* [*non sah*]. No other support. [ℵ$^{gr}$ missing.]

10. For του πυρος και θειου *copt* says "of fire (no article) *which burneth with* sulphur." So only Gr 32 + την καιομενην *post* πυρος.

(ℵ and some cursives say του θειου).

*ibid.* οπου + και ABP and most cursives *vg etc.*, but not ℵ, nor *copt*, which says ⲡⲓⲙⲁ ⲉⲧⲉ.

*ibid.* ℵ supplies οπου again before ο ψευδοπροφητης, maintaining the usual order with *copt*. *Copt* does not add, while *sah* almost reverses the order to οπου ο ψευδοπροφητης και το θηριον of Gr 18 only, apparently conflating thus: ⲡⲙⲁ ⲉⲛⲧⲁⲩⲛⲟⲩⲭⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲑⲏⲣⲓⲟⲛ ⲉⲣⲟϥ ⲛ̄ⲙ̄ ⲡⲉⲡⲣⲟⲫⲏⲧⲏⲥ ⲛ̄ⲛⲟⲩⲭ.

*ibid.* For νυκτας instead of νυκτος, by 87 alone, compare *copt* ⲛⲓⲉϩⲟⲟⲩ. Not by *sah*. *Sah* writes ⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲩⲱⲏ ⲛ̄ⲙ̄ ⲡⲉϩⲟⲟⲩ (= *nocte ac die*, reversing the order alone) while *copt*: ⲛ̄ⲛⲓⲉϩⲟⲟⲩ ⲛⲉⲙ̄ ⲛⲓⲉⲭⲱⲣϩ (with Jerome in Ezec.: *diebus et noctibus*).

*Copt* continues "unto age of the age" (ϣⲁ ⲉⲛⲉϩ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉ ⲡⲓⲉⲛⲉϩ), while *sah* "unto age of age" (ϣⲁ ⲉⲛⲉϩ ⲛ̄ⲉⲛⲉϩ). No Greeks here vary τους αιωνας των αιωνων except 29, omitting των, and 47 119 [*non* 123], omitting των αιωνων.

11. [Goussen's verse now agrees].

— και *init.* no Greeks, but *sah* and two *coptic* MSS. (*cf. Iren Novat*).

*ibid.* *Copt* and *sah* write ειδον μεγαν θρονον λευκον for ειδον θρ. λευκον μεγαν, while ℵABP *etc.* have ειδον θρ. μεγαν λευκον, bringing λευκον last, but not interposing θρονον as *copt* and *sah*. No Greeks do this nor Latins.

Apoc 50 says θρ. μεγαν και λευκον, as *Prim.*

*ibid.* "With him who sat upon it" *copt* [*non sah*].

xx. 11. επανω αυτου for επ αυτου only ℵ 38 *syr*. *Cf.* ⲉⲓϫⲱⲥ *copt* and *sah*. [See ix. 17.]

*ibid.* + του (*ante* προσωπου) only ℵAP 95 *syr* S. *Cf. copt.*

*ibid.* + αυτου (*post* προσωπου) 56 67 95 114 *syr* S *Ephr* *Cf. copt.*

*ibid.* — ο (*ante* ουρανος) 21 39 73 98. So *copt sah.*

*ibid.* For αυτης (*pro* αυτοις) of 16 44 72 *cf. copt.*

12. *Copt* adds παντας after νεκρους but no Greeks or Latins nor *sah.*

*ibid.* Here ℵ* gives us a sahidic touch: και μεγαλους και τους μικρους for μικρους και μεγαλους, for *sah* writes ⲛ̅ⲛⲟϭ ⲛ̅ⲛⲉ ⲛ̅ⲕⲟⲩⲉⲓ (μεγαλους μετα μικρων) instead of ⲛⲓⲕⲟⲩϫⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲓⲙⲓⲛⲍ† (τους μικρους μετα των μεγαλων) as *copt.* ℵ[a]AP and forty cursives also place μεγαλους first.

*ibid.* θρονου (*pro* θεου) ℵABP and most cursives = also *syr latt* and *copt* and *sah.*

*ibid.* *Copt* says "on the book" for εν τοις βιβλιοις. *Cf. syr* S.

13. *Copt* says "And (the) abyss with Amenti" ⲟⲩⲟϩ ϥⲛⲟⲩⲛ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲁⲙⲉⲛ† for και ο θανατος και ο αδης. No others change θανατος. ℵ* writes και ο τα θανατος alone, as if something might have been before him which was unusual. *Sah* says ⲡⲛⲟⲩ (θανατος) ⲛ̅ⲛ̅ ⲁⲙⲉ̅ⲛ̅ⲧⲉ.

So that we now see *triple* interchange of ⲡⲛⲟⲩ ϥⲛⲟⲩⲛ and ϥⲓⲟⲛⲉ (as earlier) for θανατος, αβυσσος, and θαλασσα.

*ibid.* *Copt* practically elides εκαστος, writing ⲟⲩⲟϩ ⲁⲩ†ϩⲁⲡ ⲉⲣⲱⲟⲩ (with *Iren*), while *sah* (*Goussen*) says ⲁⲩⲱ ⲁⲩⲕⲣⲓⲛⲉ ⲙ̅ⲙ̅ⲟⲟⲩ ⲡⲟⲩⲁ ⲡⲟⲩⲁ = *singuli, unusquisque, de singulis,* (*Balestri* = ⲁⲩⲱ ⲁⲩⲕⲣⲓⲛⲉ ⲙ̅ⲡⲟⲩⲁ ⲡⲟⲩⲁ̄).

14. Again, *copt* says "and (the) abyss (ϥⲛⲟⲩⲛ) with Amenti," that is all copt MSS. but C = ⲡⲛⲟⲩ.

[We saw above, xix. 4, that C[boh] was the type of text ℵ[gr] was following, which may account for there being no sign of *abyss* in his text here.] *Sah* has ⲡⲛⲟⲩ again.

*ibid.* — του (*ante* πυρος) *copt.* No Greeks. *Copt* uses ⲛ̅ϫⲣⲱⲙ and *sah* ⲛ̅ⲥⲁⲧⲉ.

*ibid.* *Copt* omits ουτος εστιν ο δευτερος θανατος with 1–46=88 =101–67 18 25–58–78–84–94 31 41–42–53 81* 97 114 and substitutes την καιομενην θειω (ⲉⲑⲙⲟϩ ϩⲓ ⲑⲏⲛ).

No Greeks. But ℵABP and sixty cursives add η λιμνη του πυρος including of those above only 53 81***. *Sah* (*Goussen*) stops at ⲛⲥⲁⲧⲉ eliding the last clause and substituting nothing with the Gk cursives above and *Prim*, but *Balestri* continues: ⲡⲁⲓ ⲡⲉ ⲡⲙⲟⲩ ⲙⲙⲉϩ-ⲥⲛⲁⲩ ⲉⲧⲉ ⲧⲗⲓⲙⲛⲏ ⲧⲉ ⲛⲥⲁⲧⲉ.

xx. 15. *Copt* begins this verse "and he who," literally "*with* he whom," connecting with verse 14 after his addition of ⲉⲑⲙⲟϩ ϩⲓ ⲑⲏⲛ. No Greeks. *Sah* says ⲁⲩⲱ ⲡⲉ ⲧⲉ.

*ibid.* ουχ ευρεθη *Copt* writes ⲉⲧⲉⲙⲙⲡⲟⲩⲭⲉⲙⲥ. ℵ$^{gr*}$ alone varies ευρεθη and writes ευρεθησεται. *Sah* gives ⲙⲡⲟⲩϩⲉ ⲉⲣⲟⲥ.

*ibid.* *Copt* says "*on* the book of (the) life" ϩⲓ ⲡⲭⲱⲙ ⲛⲧⲉ ⲡⲱⲛϧ. No Greeks vary ἐν except 80 which has εις την βιβλον της ζωης. *Sah* (*Goussen*) says ⲉⲡⲭⲱⲱⲙⲉ, and *Balestri* ϩⲙ ⲡⲭⲱⲱⲙⲉ.

*ibid.* For εβληθη *copt* has the active "they cast them," and εις is missing before την λιμνην. *Copt*: ⲁⲩϩⲓⲧⲟⲩ ⲉϯⲗⲩⲙⲛⲏ ⲛⲭⲣⲱⲙ; *sah* ⲁⲩⲛⲟⲭⲥ̄ ⲉⲧⲗⲓⲙⲛⲏ ⲛⲥⲁⲧⲉ. No sympathy found among Greeks or Latins.

xxi. 1. The κενον and κενην of ℵ appear to be itacisms, for we have κενην again in verse 2 by ℵ alone and κενα again verse 5. *Copt* plainly ⲙⲙⲃⲉⲣⲓ *bis* and *sah* ⲃⲃⲣⲣⲉ.

*ibid.* — πρωτη (*ante* γη) 13 29 65 = *copt* "For the first heaven with the earth" with *Iren* and *Prim* [*non Tert non gig non sah*].

*ibid.* απηλθαν ℵA, απηλθον B *etc.* *Cf.* *copt* ⲁⲩⲱⲉ, *sah* (*Goussen*) ⲁⲩⲉⲓⲛⲉ, (*Balestri*) ⲁⲩⲟⲩⲉⲓⲛⲉ (P *etc.* απηλθεν, *al.* παρηλθεν).

*ibid.* Although *copt* has a peculiar turn of phrase for και η θαλασσα ουκ εστιν ετι: ⲟⲩⲟϩ ⲙⲙⲟⲛ ⲓⲟⲙ ⲭⲉ, and *sah* is: ⲁⲩⲱ ⲑⲁⲗⲁⲥⲥⲁ ⲛⲥⲱⲟⲟⲡ ⲁⲛ ϭⲉ, none agree with change made by A$^{gr}$: και την θαλασσαν ουκ ιδον ετι. This ιδον might have come from misplacing the ιδον in next verse, but while *text. rec.* places it early in verse 2, all Greeks omitting εγω ιωαννης and including A place it later after καινην. It is possible A confused ⲁⲩⲉⲓⲛⲉ with *copt* ⲁⲓⲛⲁⲩ.

2. While all Greeks and *Prim* transfer ειδον to the place

after καινην, *copt* and *sah* have it at the beginning as in *textus receptus* (omitting of course εγω ιωαννης with all).

xxi. 2. εκ του ουρανου απο του θεου ℵAB and most with *copt* and *sah*.

3. ℵ* drops ηκουσα and writes φωνη μεγαλη, following it with λεγουσα. Neither *sah* nor *copt* do this, and the editors do not follow ℵ*.

*ibid.* But for ουρανου ℵA 18 substitute θρονου which the editors *Lachmann Tisch Westcott and Hort* and *Revisers* follow although there is only this greek support ℵA 18 with *Iren Ambr Aug vg*, both *sah* and *copt* with *syr arm aeth gig Tich Prim* and *Anonym Cassiod* opposing.

*ibid.* *Sah copt* = + ⲭⲉ before ⲓⲥ (ιδου). No Greeks.

*ibid.* *Copt* [*non sah*] supplies the verb "*being*" before "with men." No Greeks nor Latins except *Ambrose.*

*ibid.* εσκηνωσεν ℵ alone. Not *copt*, but *gig am*: habitauit. This certainly looks like a very old *Latin* mutation of u for b in *habitabit* which ℵ followed.

*ibid.* λαος P *etc.*, *cf. copt* and *sah.*

*ibid.* — και *ult.* ℵ 65, but present in *copt* and *sah.*

(65 is the interesting Moscow fragment often with ℵ alone and often with ℵ and *copt*, see xxi. 21.)

3/4. — θεος αυτων verse 3 ℵB *etc.* Agrees with *copt.*

— ὁ θεος verse 4 ℵP *etc.* Agrees with *copt.*

*Copt* writes: "And God himself shall be with them, He shall wipe every tear from their eyes."

4. ℵA 32 56 substitute εκ for απο. *Copt* = ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲉⲛ and *sah* ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲛ̄. *Sah* writes ⲛⲓⲱ for ⲛⲓⲃⲉⲛ (παν).

*ibid.* — ὁ (*ante* θανατος) ℵ 18 22*** 23 38 47 and Latin. (*Copt* ⲟⲩⲟϩ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉ ⲙⲟⲩ, *sah* ⲁⲩⲱ ⲙⲛ̄ ⲙⲟⲩ.)

*ibid.* — ουτε *tert. ante* πονος *copt* [*non sah*]. ℵ and 65 omit και πονος but no others.

*ibid.* Quite a curious thing now occurs.

For ουτε πονος ουκ εσται ετι οτι τα πρωτα απηλθον

*copt* = ⲛ̄ⲛⲉ ϩⲓⲥⲓ ϣⲱⲡⲓ ⲭⲉ · ⲉⲡⲓⲗⲏ ⲛⲓϩⲟⲩⲁ† ⲁⲩⲥⲓⲛⲓ

*sah* = ⲟⲩⲗⲉ ⲙⲛ̄ ϩⲓⲥⲉ ⲛⲁϣⲱⲡⲉ ⲭⲓⲛ ⲧⲉⲩⲛⲟⲩ ⲭⲉ ⲁ ⲛ̄ϣⲟⲣⲡ̄ ⲟⲩⲉⲓⲛⲉ.

ℵ confuses coptic ⲭⲉ and ⲉⲡⲓⲗⲏ for he substitutes οτι for ετι οτι, dropping ετι altogether. Showing that ℵ*

was wool-gathering here he continues *τα προβατα* for *τα πρωτα*. His text runs

*αυτων και θανα*
*τος ουκ εσται ετι ου*
*τε κραυγη ουτε πεν*
*θος ουκ εσται οτι*
*τα προβατα απηλ*
*θεν και ειπεν ο*
*καθημενος επι*

I do not wish to press an *error oculi*, but such it must have been. Whence? Well, leaving out coptic ⲙⲡⲣⲟⲩⲁϯ, following ⲉⲡⲓⲗⲏ, (although please to note the sound) what about the Latin PRIORA for *πρωτα*, so given (instead of *prima* of *Iren etc.*, *pristina* of *gig*) *by Primasius* and *Auct de Prom*? It would seem in connection with — *ετι* apposed to *coptic* ⲭⲉ · ⲉⲡⲓⲗⲏ, and *προβατα* for *πρωτα* sounding with Latin *priora*, that ℵ might really have had under his eye both Coptic and Latin. I do not press this nor have I sought this place. It forces itself upon the attention.

Note also with regard to the polyglot which caused the trouble (and it would really seem as if the point were well taken) that *syr* S got into trouble here, writing another variation: "*ουδε πονος εσται ετι επι τα προσωπα αυτης*." Note, retaining *ετι* dropped by ℵ, but using *επι* and the strange variation *προσωπα*. Gwynn says: "The reading of S evidently represents a Greek not Syriac variation (*επι* for *οτι*, *προσωπα* for *πρωτα*)," but what about the ⲉⲡⲓⲗⲏ of coptic in this connection?!

xxi. 4. *Copt* (all MSS., except H* which omits *with* the preceding clause) *adds* "Lo (ϩⲏⲡⲡⲉ) all things will become new," without Greek or other support. *Sah* (*Goussen*) does not add. *Copt* uses a different expression from that which occurs in the next verse.

5. *ειπε* + *μοι* 56 *syr* S. So *copt*.

*ibid.* + *και* (*ante ιδου*) A. *Cf.* + ⲭⲉ *copt* and *sah*.

*ibid.* *Copt* = *ποιῶ καινα παντα* differing from practically all Greeks, for ℵAP write *καινα ποιω παντα* with *gig*, while B *etc.* have *ποιω παντα καινα*.

*ibid.* *Copt* = *οτι*: *γραψον ουτοι οι λογοι* putting the intro-

ductory ⲭⲉ before "write these words." Strangely enough 46–88–101 have this. *Sah* employs ⲭⲉ twice, more correctly giving the Greek, and says ⲭⲉ ⲥϩⲁⲓ ⲭⲉ ⲛⲉⲓ ⲱⲁⲭⲉ.

xxi. 5. *Copt* and *sah* seem to give textus receptus' order αληθινοι και πιστοι while ℵAB *etc.* vary the order to πιστοι και αληθινοι with *gig* "fidelia et vera." (The cursives which write this order add του θεου.) The meaning of the words is so similar we need not dwell on this. *Primasius* emphasises with a superlative *Haec verba fidelissima sunt et vera.*

6. — γεγονασιν ℵ$^{a}$. So *coptic* omits altogether [not *sah*] with *aeth*? and *lux* and *Anonym* and *Tichon.*

*ibid.* — της πηγης A. Not *copt* nor *sah*, but in *copt* πηγης and υδατος are very similar ⲧⲙⲟⲩⲓ and ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲟⲩ (*sah* = ⲧⲡⲏⲩⲏ ⲙ̄ⲡⲙⲟⲟⲩ).

*ibid. fin.* δωρεας for δωρεαν ℵ*. *Cf. Latt* gratis. [*Cf.* xiv. 3 χρυσεας.]

7. ταυτα for παντα of nearly all Greeks [*non* 1–62=63–72–80 53] is agreed to by *copt* and *sah.*

8. τοις δε δειλοις of Aℵ *etc.* for δειλοις δε = *copt* and *sah.*

*ibid.* *Sah* writes ⲡⲟⲙⲏⲣⲟⲥ for πορνοις.

*ibid.* *om* πασι *copt sah* but no Greeks or Latins (*Tert* omits πασι τοις ψευδεσι).

*ibid.* + εστιν *Hippol* (*ante* εν τη λιμνη), *cf. copt.*

*ibid.* *Copt* = "in the lake *of the* fire with *the* sulphur" omitting καιομενη (which it sometimes adds). No Greeks omit, but *Tert Auct Quaest* do so. Rarely *copt* gives the article to ϫⲣⲱⲙ, but here it does so, as also to *sulphur.* No Greeks. *Cf. syr* S.

9. — προς με. Practically all Greeks. Also *copt.*

*ibid.* ο πρωτος *pro* εις 35–87 38. *Sah* = ⲛ̄ⲥⲓⲟⲩⲁ, *copt* ⲛ̄ϫⲉⲟⲩⲁⲓ. [See xxi. 19.]

*ibid.* + εκ (*post* εἰς) ℵABP and many cursives. Also *copt.*

*ibid.* [τας γεμουσας] *Copt* = ⲉⲩⲙⲉϩ, *sah* ⲉⲧⲙⲉϩ; 35–87 have τας εχουσας = *latt* habentibus. *Copt* says "filled *with*" ⲉⲩⲙⲉϩ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲉⲛ.

*ibid.* — και (*ante* ελαλησε) *copt* and *sah.* No Greeks or Latins

*ibid.* + οτι (*ante* δειξω) *copt* and *sah.* No Greeks. "veni *et* ostendam" *vg.*

xxi. 9. *την νυμφην την γυναικα του αρνιου,* order of ℵAP and only (17) 34–35–87 38 65 77 *syr* S, but with *latt* and *copt* and *sah.*

10. *Copt* and *sah* add the article before *πνευματι* but no Greeks.

*ibid.* For *επ ορος μεγα και υψηλον copt* says ⲉⲡⲱⲱⲓ ⲉⲭⲉⲛ ⲟⲩⲛⲛⲱϯ ⲛ̄ⲧⲱⲟⲩ ⲉⲫⲥ̄ⲟⲥⲓ (but *sah* only ⲉⲭⲛ̄ ⲟⲩⲧⲟⲟⲩ ⲉⲫⲭⲟⲥⲉ). Observe *επι* for *επ* by ℵA 35–87 56 59 only.

— *και* before *υψηλον* of *copt sah* = *gr* 12–46=88=101–59–67–81–100 65 114.

*ibid.* — *και* (*ante* *εδειξε*) *copt* and *sah.* No Greeks.

[After *εδειξε μοι sah* is wanting to verse 24.]

*ibid.* — *την μεγαλην* ℵABP and forty-eight cursives [not 65 114 or 119–123 although *syr* S omits] with *copt syr* S and *latt.*

*ibid.* — *του* (*ante* *θεου*) *copt.* No Greeks.

11. For *εχουσαν την δοξαν του θεου* (omitted by A 30 35 98 104) *copt* has: "she which is holy which is filled with glory" (or [other MSS.] "light"). *Cf. gr* 119–123: *εν ᾗ η γυνη του αρνιου ἡ ανω ιλημ υπο θεου κοσμηθησεται και δοξασθησεται.* (*et Sylburg ed. And.*). Observe ℵ supplies *απο* after *δοξαν.* So *gig:* a Deo *pro* Dei of the rest.

*ibid.* *Copt* practically suppresses *ομοιος* as a separate word. No Greeks.

*ibid.* For *ως λιθω ιασπιδι copt* says *ως φωστηρ ιασπιδος τιμιου.* No Greeks supply *light* or substitute it for *λιθω sec.*, but *syr* S omits *λιθω*, = *ως ιασπιδι* which virtually agrees, and some eighteen cursives omit *ως λιθω.*

*ibid.* For *κρυσταλλιζοντι copt* says "being of crystal" ⲉⲫⲟⲓ ⲛ̄ⲭⲣⲓⲥⲧⲁⲗⲗⲟⲥ. No Greeks; but Latins say *sicut cristallo,*" and *Prim:* "refulgentum in modum crystalli."

12. — *τε* ℵABP and most. So *copt*, which expresses *εχουσαν prim* (*εχουσα* ABP *etc.*; *εχοντι* ℵ *primo loco*, *εχοντας sec. loco* ℵ*, *εχουσας* ℵ[a]) by "being to her," ⲉⲟⲩⲟⲛ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲥ. Does *εχοντι* of ℵ bear any relation to this?

*ibid.* — *και* (*ante* *υψηλον*). 18. *Cf. copt.*

*ibid.* *και* (*pro* *εχουσα sec.*) 119–123. *Cf. copt* "with the twelve gates," omitting *εχουσα.*

xxi. 12. *Copt* continues "And the twelve angels at (ϩιρεⲛ '*prope*') the gates." No Greeks give this order nor Latins.

*ibid.* + αυτων (*post ονοματα*) ℵ and *syr* S. Not *copt* which says "with names written." ℵ has (with *syr gig etc.* 'scripta') γεγραμμενα for επιγεγραμμενα of the rest. The Latins vary, some *scripta*, some *inscripta* or *superscripta*. *Copt*: ⲛⲉⲓ ϩⲁⲛⲣⲁⲛ ⲉⲩⲥϧⲏⲟⲩⲧ.

*ibid.* *Copt* supplies *name* a second time, for ἅ ἐστι writing ⲉϥⲣⲁⲛ "being (the) name." So A 18 35–87 56 65 with *syr* S + τα ονοματα, and + ονοματα B and many other cursives.

13. *Copt* has the order East, South (ⲥⲁⲣⲏⲥ), West, North.

Owing to the slightly varying meaning of the points of the compass in some of the Greek words we need not dwell on any of the variations of order here.

*ibid.* *Copt* says "on the E. (ⲥⲁⲡⲉⲓⲉⲃⲧ) three gates, on the S. (ⲥⲁⲣⲏⲥ) *of her* three gates, *and* the W. (ⲡⲉⲙⲉⲛⲧ) *of the city* three gates, *and* on the N. (ⲥⲁⲡⲉⲙϩⲓⲧ) three gates." I have italicised the additions. No Greeks add "of her" or "of the city," nor Latins.

14. − εχον ℵ*. ⲉⲟⲩⲟⲛ as usual *copt*.

*ibid.* δωδεκα θεμελιους 25–78. So *copt order*.

*ibid.* + γεγραμμενον *copt* = ⲟⲩⲟϩ ⲉⲩⲥϧⲏⲟⲩⲧ ϩⲓⲱⲧⲟⲩ. No Greeks. For ϩⲓⲱⲧⲟⲩ *cf.* επ αυτων for εν αυτοις practically all Greeks.

15. *Copt* says ⲉⲟⲩⲟⲛ for ειχε. No Greeks εχων nor Latins apparently anything but *habebat*.

*ibid.* *Copt* does not add μετρον as the Greek uncials, most cursives and Latins, but adds ⲛ̄ⲧⲟⲧϥ after χρυσουν, part of periphrasis for ἔχων, thus: ⲟⲩⲕⲁϣ ⲛ̄ⲛⲟⲩⲃ ⲛ̄ⲧⲟⲧϥ. *Cf. Prim* "arundinem auream *ad mensuram*" instead of "mensuram arundinem auream."

16. και η πολις τετραγωνος (+ αυτης) κειται So ℵ. *Cf. copt*: ⲟⲩⲟϩ ϯⲃⲁⲕⲓ ⲛⲉ ⲟⲩⲧⲉⲧⲣⲁⲅⲱⲛⲟⲛ ⲧⲉ (− κειται). *Copt* continues "And as is her length thus also is her breadth" = Gk και το μηκος αυτης [ℵ omits the αυτης here] οσον και το πλατος, omitting τοσουτον εστιν of *text. recept.* with nearly all Greeks.

ℵBP omit the και before το πλατος, but *copt* has ⲟⲛ.

xxi. 16. *Copt* omits τω καλαμω substituting "he found her being" (ⲁⲥϧⲉⲙⲙⲥ ⲉⲥⲟⲓ), making ⲉⲥⲟⲓ stand for επι. No Greeks omit επι. But *copt* adds "of length" (ⲛⲱⲩⲓⲏ) after ⲙⲙⲃ ⲛⲱⲟ ⲛⲥⲧⲁⲗⲓⲟⲛ; and continues (instead of το μηκος και το πλατος και το υψος αυτης ισα εστι) by ⲛⲉⲙⲙ ⲧⲉⲥⲟⲩⲏⲱⲥⲓ ⲛⲉⲙⲙ ⲡⲉⲥⲃⲏⲥⲓ ⲉⲩⲟⲓ ⲛⲟⲩⲍⲩⲥⲟⲥ "with her breadth with her height being equal." 18 39 *syr* S add αυτης after πλατος.

17. After το τειχος αυτης *copt* supplies "it was found making." No others. *Cf.* however *Prim*: murus autem dimensus est.

*ibid.* *Copt* omits πηχων. No others.

In other words *copt* makes μετρον take the place of πηχων μετρον, for it retains the singular for μετρον.

18. ℵ* has a curious variation here, writing και ην εν δωμασι του τιχους for και ην η ενδομησις του τειχους. Please note carefully that *copt* has a totally different way of putting it from the usual Greek and the *copt* may easily have engendered the expression of ℵ*. *Copt* adds first "*And* (*the*) *circuit of the wall*—" then proceeds: "the laying foundation was being as an iaspis." Note also *gig*: "In structura murus ejus" and *Anonym*: "Et supellex muri et civitas" for the usual "Et erat structura muri ejus," or the "et fuit aedificatio muri ejus" of *Prim.*

*ibid.* — αυτης by 20 32 59. No Greeks add ως with *copt* but Latins say *ex lapide iaspide.*

*ibid.* *Copt* varies again by adding a verb in the next clause, saying "And the city was being *worked* with gold pure as glass pure."

*ibid.* For χρυσιον καθαρον the cursives 21–73–79–100–(103), 114 write χρυσιω καθαρω, as *syr* SΣ χρυσιου καθαρου, and *am* "auro mundo" and *Prim* "ex auro mundo." *Anonym* says "aurum mundum simile vitro mundo."

19 *init.* While ℵ*ABP and over fifty cursives omit και, ℵ* and *copt* retain it.

*ibid.* For κεκοσμημενοι (omitted by P 92 *gig Prim*) *copt* introduces earlier [after πολεως] "(are) *built* out of" ⲉⲩⲕⲏⲧ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲉⲛ. *Cf. Tich.*

*ibid.* The coptic order is λιθω παντι τιμιω. No Greeks thus.

*ibid.* For πρωτος ℵ writes εἰς [see xxi. 9]. *Copt* is ⲛϩⲟⲩⲓϯ.

D$^{copt}$ gives numerals for the stones instead of writing in full. ℵ$^{gr}$ begins this at the third stone.

xxi. 19. καρχηδων (*pro* χαλκηδων) 35–68 (*hiat* 87). So *copt.*

20. τοπαδιον ℵ$^{gr*}$. So D$^{copt}$ N$^{copt}$. Other coptic MSS. give ⲗⲟⲡⲁⲧⲓⲟⲛ, and ⲗⲟⲡⲁⲗⲓⲟⲛ, and one ⲗⲁⲡⲟⲗⲓⲟⲛ. Observe that it is D$^{copt}$ with N which goes exactly with ℵ$^{gr}$, and D$^{copt}$ has been running with ℵ$^{gr}$ in using numerals.

*ibid.* Some coptic MSS. invert the order of the tenth and eleventh stones. Not so ℵ$^{gr}$ nor other Greeks.

*ibid.* ⲕⲩⲥⲟⲡⲁⲣⲁⲥⲟⲥ A$^{copt}$. Others ⲭⲣⲓⲥⲟⲡⲣⲁⲥⲟⲥ, and other variations.

*ibid.* ℵ$^{gr*}$ writes αμεθυστινος, perhaps conflating *greek* and *copt*, for while *Gr* is αμεθυσος (ℵ$^{a}$ *etc.*) or αμεθυστος, *copt* says ⲁⲙⲉⲑⲓⲧⲟⲥ AEF*G*N$^{2}$ or ⲁⲙⲉⲑⲓⲥⲧⲟⲥ the rest.

21. Again the conjunction of ℵ 65 alone of Greeks witnesses to coptic conditions by omitting δωδεκα *secund.* exactly as *copt*: "And the twelve gates of pearl." *Copt* adds ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲁⲓ ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲁⲓ (ανα εις εκαστος) and closes the sentence, omitting των πυλωνων ην εξ ενος μαργαριτου. This ℵ does not agree to, nor do others. Only *syr* S says εις ανα εις· και εκαστος punctuating thus but continuing with the Greeks. But *Prim* supports the coptic exactly.

Thus ℵ 65 seem to witness independently to part of the *coptic*, while the *Latin* as represented by *Prim* witnesses to the rest!

*ibid.* For ως υαλος διαφανης *copt* has ⲙ̄ⲫⲣⲏ† ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲁⲃⲁⲭⲏⲓⲛⲓ ⲉⲫⲉⲣⲟⲩⲱⲓⲛⲓ.

22. ουκ ειδον ναον is the *copt* order. No Greeks nor Latins.

*ibid.* ℵ says οτι ο κυριος ο θεος for ο γαρ κυριος ο θεος. Not *copt* = ⲡⲥ̄ⲥ̄ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲫ† but three coptic MSS. BEF drop the ⲅⲁⲣ. None introduce with ⲭⲉ, and *sah* is still missing.

*ibid.* *Copt*, as often, says ⲡⲉⲙⲙ ⲡⲓⲍⲓⲏⲃ for και το αρνιον.

23. — του *ante* ηλιου *et ante* σεληνης *gr* 100 = *Latt.* *Copt* has the strong article before *moon* but not before *sun.*

*ibid.* — εν (*ante* αυτη) most Greeks. *Cf. copt.*

*ibid.* + εστι (*ante* το αρνιον) 41 *syr* S *gig et latt.* *Cf. copt* ⲡⲉ.

24. "And the nations shall walk from (ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲉⲛ) her light." *Cf.* Greeks against the textus receptus.

*ibid.* *Copt* uses των εθνων for αυτων with 34–35–68 (*hiat* 87)

[in fact some coptic MSS. add *αυτων*] and B and fifty cursives, but does not with the B group add *αυτω* after *φερουσιν*, but in this respect goes with the other uncials. *Copt* ⲛⲉⲙ ⲧⲧⲓⲙⲏ opposes ℵAP *etc.* which omit.

(*Sah* commences early in verse 24 and omits *the nations* and *και την τιμην.*)

xxi. 25. For *πυλωνες αυτης* (— οι) of 46–88–101 *Er Ald Col* 57 *cf.* ⲛⲉⲥⲡⲩⲗⲱⲛ *copt.* The *boh* follows *Gr.* order here but *sah* places ⲛ̄ ⲛⲉⲥⲡⲩⲗⲱⲛ after *ου μη κλεισθωσιν.*

*ibid.* For *ημερας copt* writes ⲙ̄ⲡⲓⲉϩⲟⲟⲩ supplying the article. No Greeks vary *ημερας* except ℵ* = *ημερα* (and 100 = *νυκτος*). This *ημερα* appears to be the equivalent of Latin *die* by *Prim* and *Anonym.* Others say *per diem* as *gig* and *vg.* As regards *νυκτος* of 100, two coptic MSS. A$^{mg}$F add ⲛⲉⲙⲡⲓⲉⲭⲱⲣϩ after ⲙ̄ⲡⲓⲉϩⲟⲟⲩ.

*ibid.* For *νυξ γαρ* following, *copt* has ⲟⲩⲟϩ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉ ⲉⲭⲱⲣϩ, but other MSS. supply ⲧⲁⲣ.

26. In a note Horner says omit this verse B$^{copt}$ "cf. gr. 1." This almost implies that gr. 1 omits, and indeed *Er* 1 2 3 *Ald Col* and 57 do omit. Delitzsch explained that this was due in the Erasmus edition (Del. Handschriftliche Funde, Heft 1, p. 51) to confusion with the commentary but that Apoc 1 has the verse.

*ibid.* *Copt* has a different order here from Greek both in *boh* and *sah* which vary.

For *και οισουσι* (32 alone varies with *ηξουσι*) *την δοξαν και την τιμην των εθνων εις αυτην*, *boh* writes ⲉⲩⲉⲓⲛⲓ (MS. A and text Horner ⲉⲩⲉⲓ) ⲛ̄ⲭⲉⲛⲓⲉⲑⲛⲟⲥ ⲙ̄ⲡⲟⲩⲱⲟⲩ (MS. A and text ⲛⲉⲙ ⲡⲟⲩⲱⲟⲩ) ⲛⲉⲙ ⲡⲟⲩⲧⲁⲓⲟ ⲉϫⲟⲩⲛ ⲉⲣⲟⲥ, and *sah*: ⲛ̄ⲥⲉ ⲭⲓ ⲉϩⲟⲩⲛ ⲉⲣⲟⲥ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲟⲟⲩ ⲛ̄ⲙ̄ ⲡⲧⲁⲓⲉⲟ ⲛ̄ ⲛ̄ϩⲉⲑⲛⲟⲥ.

In both cases "the nations" occupies a different position from that in the Greek. (Two Gr MSS. 98 and 102 omit *των εθνων.*)

For the initial ⲉⲩⲉⲓ of *boh* *cf.* + *ινα εισελθωσι* of B and fifty cursives at the end of the verse.

27. While *sah* has *και init.*, *copt* goes without it. *Copt* says "Anything defiled (ⲉⲫⲥⲱϥ) shall not enter her with those who make defilements (ⲛ̄ϩⲁⲛⲥⲱϥ)," and continues, eliding *και tert.* and enlarging the clause "Falsehood

shall not come into her." *Sah* is somewhat different. The Greeks hardly vary. But *cf.* ℵ*, who has alone και ο ποιωσει for και ποιουν, to *gig*'s "quod facit" (against *faciens* of the other Latins). This with coptic construction and Latin sympathy in previous verse 25 ημερα by ℵ* (*die*) seems definitely to connect ℵ* with *copt* and *latin* under his very eye.

xxi. 27. For ει μη *copt* [*non sah*] has ⲉⲃⲏⲗ ⲉⲙⲏ ("except they who").

*ibid.* For γεγραμμενοι 31 47 84 have εγγεγραμμενοι. *Cf. copt* "written *on* the book of life (ϩⲓ ⲡⲓⲭⲱⲙ)."

*ibid.* Now occurs something not to be neglected in our considerations. For ℵ writes $\overline{\text{ονν}}$ου for αρνιου *fin.* Surely this is a commentary on our contention. We have spoken of the *sound* of the words under the eye of the scribe of ℵ both in Latin and coptic as well as in Greek, and have entered in spirit into the scribe's work fifteen hundred years ago as we sat with him at his work. As he copied so he repeated to himself mentally as any copyist does. Here is the proof of the mental process at work, writing ουρανου for αρνιου, although no authorities vary at this place, and none of our other Greeks have done this, easy as it is to do.

xxii. 1. — καθαρον ℵABP and forty cursives = *copt* and *latin.* Latins, as coptic, say later: *splendidum sicut cristallum,* but *Prim* and *Vigil Taps* here say *candidum,* and *Fulg* once *splendidum* and once *candidum. Anonym* omits the word altogether, while *syr* S doubles it at this place: καθαρον και λαμπρον ως, as greek 18.

*ibid.* ℵ alone omits του before θρονου = Latin, not coptic = ⲡⲓⲑⲣⲟⲛⲟⲥ.

2. *Copt* "on this side and on that" = ⲥⲁⲙⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲙ ⲥⲁⲙⲛⲁⲓ. ℵ omits εντευθεν *sec.* but also ξυλον ζωης following, without authority.

For the *hinc et inde* of *gig*, other Latins substitute *ex utraque parte.*

*ibid.* For ποιουν καρπους δωδεκα *copt* says "bringing the twelve fruits forth" (ⲉⲣⲓⲙⲓ $\overline{\text{ⲙⲙⲓ}}$ ⲓ$\overline{\text{ⲃ}}$ ⲛⲟⲩⲧⲁϩ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ).

*ibid.* For κατα μηνα ενα *copt* says "one for a month" (ⲟⲩⲁⲓ ϯⲁⲣⲁ [some MSS. ⲕⲁⲧⲁ] ⲁⲃⲟⲧ), [*cf.* 56], omitting

altogether the clause εκαστον αποδιδουν τον καρπον αυτου. No Greeks. ℵ has κατα μηνα αποδιδους (— ενα) reading with Latins *per singulos menses reddens.*

xxii. 2. *Copt* [*non sah*] says "and the leaves of the tree for an healing *the eyes* of the nations." No others. ℵ omits των before εθνων (alone) = *latt.*

3. For καταθεμα (καταναθεμα *receptus*) *copt* uses ⲥⲱϥ (as in xxi. 27 for κοινουν and ⲭⲁⲛⲥⲱϥ βδελυγμα). ℵ* writes καταγμα.

*ibid.* —του (*ante* θεου) *copt.* No Greeks.

*ibid.* εσται εν αυτη 18. So *copt.*

*ibid.* After και ο θρονος του θεου και του αρνιου εσται εν αυτη *copt* adds "And anger shall not be." No Greeks.

*ibid.* *Copt* [*non sah*] introduces the last clause with ⲁⲗⲗⲁ.

*ibid.* του θεου (*pro* αυτου) 7–45–104 47 92 = *copt* [not *sah* nor Latins].

5. — εκει B *etc.*; ετι (*pro* εκει) ℵAP 35–68 56 65 108** (108**=56) *latt*, with *copt* which expresses it ⲛⲛⲉ ⲉⲭⲱⲣⲭ ⲯⲱⲡⲓ ⲭⲉ.

*ibid.* *Copt* expresses και *sec.* and *tert.* by ⲟⲩⲁⲉ. No Greeks, but *Prim* and some Latins.

*ibid.* + εν αυτη *copt* after λυχνου (ⲛ̄ⲧⲏⲧⲥ). No Greeks.

*ibid.* + φωτος (*ante* λυχνου) ℵA 18 47 56 80 108** *syr* S. } + φως *ante* λυχνου 21–73–79–100–103 65, } and "lumen lucernae" *gig* and Latins.

This becomes an exceedingly interesting coptic-latin place because ⲛ̄ⲧⲏⲧⲥ of the coptic MSS. ACD$^{mg}$EFG*N is written by the change of one letter only ⲛ̄ⲧⲏⲃⲥ by *copt* MSS. BD*G$^{c}$HZ with T$^{t}$; the former representing εν αυτη and the latter approximating the addition here of the small but important graeco-latin group as above. Perhaps someone can explain away this significant graeco-coptic-latin affiliation. I cannot. It involves doubling the λυχνου. Reading as ℵA *etc.* φωτος λυχνου, lumine lucernae *vg Anonym*, luce lucernae *Ambr* 1/3, or φως λυχνου 21 *etc. gig Prim.*

*ibid.* επ αυτους for αυτους ℵA 18 35–68 (*hiat* 87) *gig Prim Ambr Anon. Cf.* ⲉⲣⲱⲟⲩ *copt* (ⲉⲣⲟⲟⲩ *sah*) which can be confused for ⲉⲣⲟ the preposition.

[To show how easily confusion can occur I caught

myself writing ⲉⲣⲟⲩⲣⲟ for ⲉⲣⲱⲟⲩ above, reading two words further on ⲉⲩⲉ ⲉⲣⲟⲩⲣⲟ "they shall reign."]

xxii. 5. ⲉⲓⲥ ⲧⲟⲛ ⲁⲓⲱⲛⲁ ⲧⲟⲩ ⲁⲓⲱⲛⲟⲥ 12 40. *Cf. copt* ⲉⲓⲥ ⲁⲓⲱⲛⲁ ⲧⲟⲩ ⲁⲓⲱⲛⲟⲥ (ϣⲁⲉⲛⲉϩ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲡⲓⲉⲛⲉϩ).

6. + ⲟⲧⲓ before ⲟⲩⲧⲟⲓ 56 and 108** = *copt* and *sah* + ⲭⲉ.

*ibid.* *Copt* amplifies to three attributes, saying "These words are faithful (ⲥⲉⲛϩⲟⲧ) and they are holy (and) they are true (ϩⲁⲛⲙⲉⲑⲙⲏⲓ)."

Note the gloss in 12 21–73–79–100–103, but none add ⲁⲅⲓⲟⲓ.

In 12 21–73–79–100–103 the order is ⲁⲗⲏⲑⲓⲛⲟⲓ ⲕⲁⲓ ⲡⲓⲥⲧⲟⲓ.

*ibid.* + ο (*ante* ⲕⲩⲣⲓⲟⲥ) ℵA 35 58 72 92 *syr* S. *Cf. copt* ⲡ̄ⲥ̄.

*ibid.* ⲡⲛⲉⲩⲙⲁⲧⲱⲛ ⲧⲱⲛ for ⲁⲅⲓⲱⲛ by ℵABP and most cursives is agreed to by *copt* and *sah*, while the Egyptian group 34–35–68 (*hiat* 87) and *syr* S conflate with ⲧⲱⲛ ⲡⲛⲉⲩⲙⲁⲧⲱⲛ ⲧⲱⲛ ⲁⲅⲓⲱⲛ against the other Greeks and Latins.

*ibid.* + ⲙⲉ (*ante* ⲧⲟⲛ ⲁⲅⲅⲉⲗⲟⲛ) ℵ* 26–41–42 53 107 only. That is to say these codices wish to read: "*And* the Lord God sent *me* his angel to show to his servants the things which must shortly come to pass." Now this occurs nowhere else *nor in the Latins.* But the *coptic* shows an ⲙ here = ⲙ̄ⲡⲉϥⲁⲅⲅⲉⲗⲟⲥ, and Goussen's *sah* actually writes ⲙⲙⲟⲓⲡⲉϥⲁⲅⲅⲉⲗⲟⲥ. Could anything be more interesting as to ℵ* in such a connection, when we see this had nothing to do with the Latins? Whence could this come except *via* the *copt* or *sah*? It is not present in *syr* S. Gwynn does not quote it for the MSS. of *syr* Σ, but *Tisch.* quotes *syr* with ℵ* from *syr*$^{sch}$, which has very definitely "misit me, me angelum suum." No doubt this is late, following *copt.* [See Gwynn elsewhere on *Apoc.* version among the Syrian churches, "*Remnants of the later Syriac versions.*"]

7. "Lo I come lo I come quickly" some *copt* MSS. (not *sah*) and no Greeks or Latins.

*ibid.* ⲧⲁⲭⲩ *sah*, but ⲛ̄ⲭⲱⲗⲉⲙ *copt.*

*ibid.* "the words of *this* prophecy of this book." So *sah* and *copt. Cf. gig* "verba libri prophetie *hujus*" against other Latins "verba prophetiae libri hujus." No Greeks add ταυτης to της προφητειας.

xxii. 8. — και *copt* and *sah* with *syr* S and some Latins *am fu lips*[6]. No Greeks.

*ibid.* For ο βλεπων ταυτα και ακουων, ℵ and twenty-seven cursives with *syr* S and *Dionys* write ο βλεπων και ακουων ταυτα, while AB and nearly all others put ακουων first: "ο ακουων και βλεπων ταυτα" with Latin order. *Copt* and *sah* go with ℵ. *Copt* uses "He who *saw* and he who *heareth* these things." *Cf. latt* "audivi et vidi" (in the other order) but *syr* S "εβλεψα και ηκουσα." *Gr* 18 is the only one to use the article twice with *copt*, but that MS. gives the other order ὁ ακουων και ὁ βλεπων ταυτα.

*ibid.* For the και οτε ηκουσα και εβλεψα following, *copt* [not *sah*] says "*Then* (ⲧⲟⲧⲉ) having heard and having seen *these things*."

Note "Et *postquam*" of *gig vg* and some Latins.

*Sah* merely says ⲁⲩⲱ ⲁⲓⲛⲁⲩ ⲉⲣⲟⲟⲩ.

+ οτε a second time $B^{gr}$ *etc.* may be compared to *copt* ⲉⲧⲁⲓⲥⲱⲧⲉⲙ . . . ⲉⲧⲁⲓⲛⲁⲩ.

ταυτα here finds no agreement among Greeks.

*ibid.* — προσκυνησαι *copt*, using the regular "I threw myself down" for επεσα.

*ibid.* For δεικνυοντος μοι *copt* says "*who* showed to me." No Greeks, but equals Latin "qui mihi ista ostendit," or ostendebat.

9. *Copt* ⲛⲏⲓ ⲭⲉ ⲙ̄ⲫⲣ ⲁⲛⲟⲕ ⲟⲩⲱⲫⲣ ⲙ̄ⲃⲱⲕ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲕ losing the γαρ with ℵAB and most.

*ibid.* + εγω 4–20–48–74 31–106 32 34. So *copt* ⲁⲛⲟⲕ as above.

*ibid.* "Worship God" in this order *copt*. No Greeks follow nor Latins [*gig* is wanting]. *Sah* omits the words, but continues with verse 10 *init*. *Gig* skips the words and the first part of verse 10 to βιβλιου τουτου with *gr* 98 102.

10. ειπε *pro* λεγει *syr* S and Σ. *Cf. copt sah* ⲡⲉϫⲁϥ.

*ibid.* + τουτους *post* λογους ℵ*. Not *copt*, but *copt* adds ταυτης after λογους to apply to προφητειας.

*ibid.* ο καιρος γαρ (— οτι) ℵAB *etc.* So *copt* and *sah* and some Latins.

11. + και of 34–35–68 (*hiat* 87) *syr* S *Prim* is *not* agreed to by *copt* nor *sah* nor other Latins.

xxii. 11. — ετι *sec.* *copt* [*non sah*] ; — ετι *prim.* *Cypr* *Anonym* *Prim* *sah* [*non copt*]. No others omit.

*ibid.* — και (*in primo loco*) *copt* [*non sah*].

*ibid.* — και *sec.* (*ante* ο δικαιος) *copt* [*non sah*].

*ibid.* — ετι (*tert. et quart.*) *Cypr* *et copt* [*non sah*] (— ετι *tert.* *gr* 41 *non al.*).

12. *init.* — και ℵAB *etc.* So *copt* and *sah.*

*ibid.* — και *sec.* *copt* [*non sah nec al.*].

*ibid.* For αποδουναι εκαστω ως το εργον αυτου εσται *copt* says "I will give to each one according to his works" (ⲕⲁⲧⲁ ⲛⲉⲫⲃⲏⲟⲩⲓ *copt*, ⲕⲁⲧⲁ ⲡⲉⲫⲃⲱⲃ *sah*). This "κατα τα εργα αυτου" is borne out by the group 21–73–79–100–103 and *syr* S.

The δωσω of *copt* = και δωσω *syr* S, ut reddam *gig* [*al.* reddere]. Notice that ℵ* with αποδοθηναι (alone for αποδουναι) keeps in the Latin company (apart from *gig*) and does not render κατα *etc.* as we might expect with *copt sah* 21 *etc.*

13. — ειμι ℵAB and *most* Greeks. *Copt* and *sah* have ⲡⲉ.

*ibid.* *Copt* says ⲁⲛⲟⲕ ⲡⲉ ⲡⲓⲁⲗⲫⲁ ⲛⲉⲙ ⲡⲓⲱ ϯⲁⲣⲭⲏ ⲛⲉⲙ ⲡⲓⲭⲱⲕ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ.

*Sah* says ⲁⲛⲟⲕ ⲡⲉ ⲁⲗⲫⲁ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲱ ⲡⲥ̅ⲟⲣ̅ⲡ̅ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲡⲥⲁⲉ ⲧⲁⲣⲭⲏ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲡⲭⲱⲕ.

Thus *copt* elides ο πρωτος και ο εσχατος altogether. No others; but ℵAB give the sahidic order with *syr* and *latt.* A$^{gr}$ elides ὁ before πρωτος, writing πρωτος και εσχατος η αρχη και το τελος.

14. ℵA both go to the *sahidic* here with 38, for they write οι πλυνοντες τας στολας αυτων for οι ποιουντες τας εντολας αυτου, while 56 108** conflate, giving both readings. *Copt* is plain for "do (or *keep*) his commandments," with all other Greeks, Tertullian, Cyprian, gigas, syriac. The vulgate goes with ℵA 38 *sah* and Fulgentius, replacing Primasius here. I do not therefore consider this a pure *sahidic* reading of ℵA, for it was fairly widespread and may have come from Latin, but it must be taken into consideration in balancing the evidence. Rather a pretty point in this connection is given by the greek MS. 59 which has φυλασσοντες (for ποιουντες) with three coptic MSS.; 59 has been with us often. And

observe 34–35–68 oppose ℵA 38. *Copt* adds παντες without Greek support.

xxii. 14. και (*pro* ινα) 41–42. *Cf. sah* ⲭⲉ, while *copt* has ϩⲓⲛⲁ.

*ibid.* As to order of 35–68 η εξουσια αυτων εσται *cf. copt* and *sah.*

*ibid.* As to ινα (ϩⲓⲛⲁ *copt*) or ως (ⲭⲉ *sah*) see ℵ* which actually conflates both readings here, writing:

οι πλυνοντες τας
στολας αυτων ϊνα
εσται η εξουσια αυτ̄ω
ως δε η εξουσια επι
το ξυλον της ζωης.

*ibid.* Greeks do not vary the order, but *copt* says "and they shall go into the city *by* the gate" (ⲟⲩⲟϩ ⲉⲩⲉϣⲉ ⲉϧⲟⲩⲛ ⲉⲧⲃⲁⲕⲓ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϧⲉⲛ ⲡⲓⲡⲩⲗⲱⲛ) while *sah* = ⲁⲩⲱ ⲛ̄ⲥⲉⲃⲱⲕ ⲉϩⲟⲩⲛ ϩⲓⲧⲛ̄ ⲙ̄ⲡⲩⲗⲏ ⲉϩⲟⲩⲛ ⲉⲧ ⲡⲟⲗⲓⲥ. *Syr* S gives τω πυλωνι. *Latt* "per portas."

15. — δε ℵAB and eighty cursives, but not *copt* nor *sah.*

*ibid.* και οι ποιουντες το ψευδος (— ο φιλων και) 18 only with *copt* (all MSS.); while *sah* has ⲛ̄ⲙ̄ ⲟⲩⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲙ̄ ⲉⲧⲉⲓⲣⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲧⲙ̄ⲙⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲥⲟⲗ.

This order of ποιων και φιλων is given by ℵB, ο ποιων και φιλων by 4–20–48–64–74 31–106 32 34, and ο ποιων και ο φιλων by 35–68.

*Gig*, apparently alone of Latins, goes with them "*qui facit et amat.*"

*Syr* says βλεπων και ποιων keeping the order of the majority of Greeks and Latins but substituting βλεπων. The seat of the variations must therefore be very ancient.

16. *Copt* says "these *words*" for ταυτα (ⲛ̄ⲛⲁⲓⲥⲁϫⲓ). No Greeks. But *sah* = ϩⲛ̄ ⲛⲁⲓ.

*ibid.* εν (*pro* επι) A and 18 21–73–79–80–100–103 38 56–108**, all interesting cursives; so Latins, *copt* ϧⲉⲛ and *sah* ϩⲛ̄. Twenty cursives, headed by 1, omit επι altogether.

*ibid.* — του (*ante* δ̄α̅δ̄) ℵAB and most with *copt.*

*ibid.* + και (*ante* ο αστηρ) over twenty cursives, including 34–35–68, *syr* and *copt* (ⲛⲉⲙ) *sah* (ⲁⲩⲱ), but not Latins nor Greek uncials which here go with them and oppose *copt* and *syr.*

xxii. 16. For ο λαμπρος ο πρωινος (*t. r.* και ορθρινος is not legitimate) of most, *copt* says "which riseth in the morning." *Sah* = ⲙ̅ⲡⲡⲁϩ ⲛ̅ϩⲧⲟⲟⲩⲉ ⲉⲧⲟ ⲛ̅ⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓⲛ. As to *copt* compare 35, which, alone apparently, writes ο πρωινος leaving out ο λαμπρος.

17. ℵ omits the articles before πνευμα and νυμφη. Consider *copt* (all MSS. apparently) which runs the beginning of verse 17 on to the end of verse 16, thus: ⲛⲉⲙ ⲡⲛ̅ⲁ ⲛⲉⲙ ⲧϣⲉⲗⲉⲧ. Ⲟⲩⲟϩ ⲥⲉϫⲱ ⲙⲙⲟⲥ . . . . *Sah* differently: ⲁⲩⲱ ⲡⲉ ⲡⲛ̅ⲁ ⲛ̅ⲙ̅ ⲧϣⲉⲗⲉⲉⲧ ⲥⲉϫⲱⲙ̅ⲙⲟⲥ. ℵ however seems distinctly to savour of *Latin* here "Et spiritus et sponsa." And *no other* Greeks omit.

*ibid.* *Copt* and *sah* emphasize "Come" by ϫⲉ ⲁⲙⲟⲩ on both occasions.

*ibid.* — και (*ante* ο θελων) ℵAB and most with *copt*, not *sah*.

*ibid.* — το (*ante* υδωρ) ℵAB and most. So *copt* and *sah*.

18. μαρτυρω εγω (*pro* συμμαρτυρουμαι γαρ) AB and most = *copt*. (ℵ writes η μαρτυρω εγω. *Copt* and *sah* words for μαρτυρω begin with ⲧ. *Cf.* x. 1 η θριξ *pro* ιρις ℵ* [*copt* ⲧⲓⲣⲓⲥ].)

*ibid.* + τω (*ante* ακουοντι) ℵAB and most. *Cf. copt* ⲛ̅ⲟⲩⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲃⲉⲛ ⲉⲧⲥⲱⲧⲉⲙ very definitely and *cf. Prim* "omnes qui audiunt" against usual Latin "omni audienti."

*ibid.* + ταυτης (*ante* της προφητειας) *copt* and *sah* as usual.

*ibid.* *Copt* (and *sah* + ϫⲉ) "*That* he who will add to them, God will add to them the plagues which are written on this book."

The Gr MSS. are rather confused here.

19 *init.* ⲫⲏ ⲗⲉ *copt.* All Greeks και and *sah* with Latins *Et.*

*ibid.* + τουτων (*post* λογων) ℵ (as before) while *copt* adds τουτου to βιβλιου and ταυτης to της προφητειας. Some cursives (21–73–79–80–100–103 25–58–78–84–94 62–63–72 75**) write: της προφητειας του βιβλιου τουτου agreeing partially with *copt*.

*ibid.* του ξυλου *pro* βιβλου *sec.* ℵAB and most (with *sah*) but *copt* holds to "book" (ⲡϫⲱⲙ) with *textus receptus* and exceedingly few Greeks but some Latins.

Here *Latin* and *Coptic* come very strong against *Sah* and *Greek*. But *sah* (*Goussen*) really writes ⲱⲏⲛ not ⲱⲉ = *hortus*? or *silva arborum*, rather than ξυλον.

*ibid.* — εκ A 10 38 must be taken into account against Latins (*de* civitate) and the rest, and *sah* ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲛ ⲧⲡⲟⲗⲓⲥ but can be accounted for in *copt*, which says ⲛⲉⲓⲓ ϯⲃⲁⲕⲓ ⲉⲑⲟⲩⲁⲃ.

xxii. 19. — και *ult.* ℵAB and nearly all = also *copt* "which are written."

*ibid.* For γεγραμμενων read εγγεγραμενων with 35–68 (*hiat* 87 [*non* 34]) for the equivalent of coptic "written *upon* this book."

20. *Copt* for: ναι ερχομαι ταχυ αμην says "They will happen and they come quickly." Note, ℵ* has ειναι before ναι, reading ειναι ναι ερχομαι ταχυ, also omitting αμην with *copt* and 18 62–63–72 65 *syr* S *gig*. The ειναι might be a mistake, but as 18 65 join in omitting αμην it might well be that ℵ had a corrupt text before him, for, as Horner says in a note as to this coptic sentence, "the text is probably corrupt."

*ibid.* — ναι *sec.* ℵAB and some cursives. So *syr* S *gig* and *copt*.

*ibid.* For κυριε ιησου *copt* has "*our* Lord Jesus Christ" (ⲡⲉⲛⲟ̅ⲥ̅ ⲓ̅ⲏ̅ⲥ̅ ⲡⲭ̅ⲥ̅). Add χριστε ℵ[a] and nearly forty cursives.

*Sah* rather different: ⲡⲭⲟⲉⲓⲥ ⲓ̅ⲥ̅.

21. Although *sah* is close to the usual text with: ⲧⲉϫⲁⲣⲓⲥ ⲙ̅ⲙ̅ⲡⲉⲛϫⲟⲉⲓⲥ ⲓ̅ⲥ̅ ⲛⲓⲓ ⲛⲉⲧⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ ϩⲁⲙⲏⲛ, omitting χριστου with ℵA 10 26–41–42–53–107 47 56–108** (but not omitting παντων as do ℵ *gig*) *coptic* is quite free and novel, continuing as from verse 20 *fin.* thus:

"upon all the saints unto age of the ages."

True, των αγιων = ℵB and most cursives, but η χαρις του κυριου ιησου is completely omitted and εις αιωνα των αιωνων added, and this seems to be the reading of all Horner's coptic codices except one. Note that *gig* says "supra sanctos" for μετα παντων υμων or μετα παντων των αγιων. A curious ending by *copt* in view of the wording of the last few verses!

*Copt* omits αμην with only A 21–73–79–80–81 58* 59–67 *gig*, but *sah* has it.

## ADDITIONAL NOTES ON LATIN, AND SHORT EXCURSUS ON SYRIAC.

As to the Latin being *underlying*—by that I mean the product of a trilingual executed originally outside of Egypt and Africa—we have the silent witness of St. Jerome, who in his Vulgate of the Apoc. gives us readings agreeing with Gwynn's Syriac, Coptic, and certain Greek MSS. in combination, yet not present in other Latin MSS. which have reached us. In fact, the self-same phenomena are to be observed here as those to which I have alluded in the Gospel quotations of St. Jerome [see Apoc. xv. 3, xix. 20, *etc.*].

And the Syriac appears basic. We have devoted considerable attention to Dean Gwynn's exposé of his Syriac MS. formerly in the library of Lord Crawford, and although we cannot speak at great length on the subject here, yet we will say a few words, for it appears to go behind ℵ, Gigas' latin, and behind both coptics, and if it does not represent an Aramaic base, it looks at least to be a very old graeco-syriac recension.

Besides lying behind ℵ, gigas, and coptic, it has impressed itself in a most remarkable manner on certain very important greek cursives which have not been examined hitherto, such as 18 40 46 56 59 119, and which will be published by me very shortly, I hope; besides 36 38, already partially known, which are in the same case. And we can show precisely the same phenomena of renderings and readings in these cursives, which must result only from overflow of Syriac and Latin in its earliest stages on the parents of these MSS. just as on the elder uncials ℵA. In fact, some of the matters involved border on translation or retranslation into Greek. Thus, at that very polyglot place where there was some basic error, 59 actually says τα αρχαια for τα πρωτα (xxi. 4). It may be remembered that *syr* S says τα προσωπα for τα πρωτα and ℵ* τα προβατα! the Latins varying between *prima* (*Iren vg etc.*), *pristina* (*gig*), *priora* (*Prim* and *Auct de prom*). But the whole place is very involved, ℵ substituting οτι for ετι *sec.*, AP 59 65 67 81 114 omitting οτι, and *syr* S saying ουδε πονος εσται ετι επι τα προσωπα αυτης, while *copt* adds at end "lo all things will become new."

In writing my Introduction to Apoc. 18, years ago, I find that I said "The original text of 18 may have preceded all our uncials."

This was long before Dean Gwynn had uncovered the readings of *syr* S. One's impressions thus are worth recording at the time, for in 1908 when I began to compare the results of my Greek collations up to Apoc. 106, I found that 18 had the strongest *syr* S sympathy and was alone with that MS. many times.

Dean Gwynn says of *syr* S, "It has strength and freedom such as few translations attain; such in fact that (with the help of such examples as I have brought together in Appendix F) it would not be difficult to make out a plausible case for accepting it as the Aramaic original or a close reproduction of an Aramaic original of the Book . . ."

We are now face to face with what was pre-syrian. We know there was a pre-alexandrian and a pre-coptic. But was there a pre-syrian and a pre-western? Or have we not now narrowed the matter down to syriac and western (i.e. latin) being the same as the original Greek, from which sprang the other variations?

Dean Gwynn in his admirable "dépouillement" of the Crawford Syriac of the Apoc. has carefully brought the matter to a head in his notice in *Transactions of the Royal Irish Academy* (vol. xxx., Part x., 1893, pp. 415/18), reaching much the same conclusions as I am doing as to the Latin.

If we have traces of apparent syriac and latin originals, or such authoritative contemporary versions which can be classed as such, many difficulties disappear, and the practical agreement of *Coptic Syriac* and *Latin* in the *Apoc.* and elsewhere goes a long way towards solving the problem.

The Western and Eastern, *i.e.* Latin and Syriac, transfer themselves at the outset of the text history to African soil. They imbed themselves there, but return—mutilated and disfigured—to Syria, the Greek Archipelago, Magna Graecia, Italy, Gaul, and England, where Africanisms and degenerations are incorporated and sometimes wrongly identified with these countries instead of with Africa and early African translators and writers.

Dean Gwynn is impressed by the fine character of the version of the Crawford Syriac, as the rest of us are (or should be) by the similar fine flavour of the Old Latin *gigas* version (of Acts and Apoc.) = *Lucifer* = a text current considerably earlier than Lucifer himself. Wiseman considered Sardinia, the home of Lucifer, to equal Africa, but this *gigas* version = *Lucifer* = Sardinia shows rather that it was western, and probably the

purest survival of the original Latin rendering. Gigas' latin is inferior in the Apoc. to that of the Acts, but *gloria et imperium* for ἡ δοξα και το κρατος (Apoc. i. 6) certainly has an imperial ring (we cannot properly say western), while *Fleury* has *claritas et potestas*, which is colourless.

Now what can we learn further from Crawford Syriac, Gigas, and Graeco-latin and Greek MSS. ?

The reaction of *syr* on *gig* is so marked that we need not dwell on it.

Sometimes the indeterminate plural is followed, as at xviii. 23, the unusual εν ταις φαρμακειαις = *gig : in veneficiis.* Often it is not followed. No Greeks thus.

Even the dropping of ἐν in the Latin can be traced to this source (xviii. 23 again) by $C^{gr}$ and *syr* S alone. So *gig : lucebit tibi*, where there is no place for ἐν.

Reaction of Latin is perhaps well shown at xix. 5 αινειτε τον θεον by most Greeks, but αινειτε τω θεω by ℵCABP and some cursives (9 14 27 36 41–42 43 53 67 73 79 82 92 103 108), or *laudem dicite Deo* by *gig vg* and *most* Latins for *laudate Deum* of *Prim.* Everywhere else in the N.T. where αἰνέω or ἐπαινέω is used the accusative follows without variation among Greeks as also in the Latin.

Even at xix. 15 the syriac seems sure for αυτω instead of αυτη. Gwynn hesitates, but our codices 16 and 38 witness for αυτω, falsely of course, from *ipso* or *eo* of the Latin to agree with *gladius acutus*, whereas in the Greek it has to agree with ρομφαια οξεια.

Irenaeus translator got over this by *graecising* "gladius acutus" and writes: "Et de ore ejus procedit *romphaca acuta* ut *in ea* percutiat gentes."

So at xxi. 4 a curious little case appears. *Text. rec.* gives the slightly redundant negative clause ουτε πονος ουκ εσται ετι. The Syriac removes the ουκ. The style of the Latin necessitates this and so *gigas* writes "neque dolor erit amplius" (other Latins all vary slightly). The omission of ουκ is not observed in the Greeks.

We might also attribute to reflex action the τον αιωνα̣ of ℵ *syr* S and Σ from the Latin plural *saecula*, as we can see actually occurs in some of our graeco-latin cursives. This may be *via coptic* for ℵ however.

Latin and syriac draw together at :

ii. 25. Greek is : πλην ο εχετε κρατησατε

but *Syr* = ο ουν εχετε κρατησατε
*Prim* = Sed quod habetis tenete
*gig. vg* = Tamen id quod habetis tenete
*harl* = Tamen quod habetis tenete

xv. 1. *syr* S αλλας *pro* τας εσχατας
*cf. h*; "illas novissimas"

xvi. 3. *Gr.* και εγενετο αιμα ως νεκρου
*syr.* S και εγενετο η θαλασσα ως νεκρος
*gig* et factum est mare sanguis sicut mortui
*h* et factum est mare velut mortuis sanguis

where *mare* intrudes in *gig* and *h* although retaining *sanguis*.

xix. 9. *Gr.* κεκλημενοι.
*syr latt.* vocati sunt.

Until reaching Apoc. 106 we left Gwynn's Syriac and the Latin representatives severely alone, so as not to imbibe any bias in dealing with our Greek MSS. Our families were then, however, sufficiently grouped for us to proceed further and to begin to handle an intensely interesting development of the problem.

There are a great many "new" readings which stand out in an examination of the Crawford MS. But this does not complicate the problem to-day, for we can prove most of them to be mere errors. Without a thorough examination of the cursives, as well as of the uncials and Versions, we might lend undue weight to some of these readings. But now that we can identify, as we do, the groups 21–28–73–79–103 with 25–58–70–78–84–94 as pure family MSS. tracing to *syr* S or its ancestor, and observe such close connection with ℵ 18 and 36 and 38 and 40, 114 and 119–123, and the group 34–35–68–87 in different places, we feel quite sure that these novelties of *syr* S merit but scant attention.

Gwynn has helped us mightily, for he is one of the most careful, painstaking, and thorough men in this department. True, some of his references to the cursives are imperfect, but he was only copying what others gave as to these, and could not follow up all the clues which a more thorough examination of them reveals. To him 35 and 87 were mere MSS. of single and slight independent force†; the same with 14–92 or any others. "One other MS.

† So closely are the Syriac and Egyptian related that it used to be considered that 28 and 87 were almost one MS., whereas 87 really belongs to the Egyptian group 34–35–68–87, and 28 belongs to the syriac group 21–28–73–79–103.

reads thus" conveys nothing. But when, after examining scores and scores of MSS., we narrow down such MSS. to certain defined groups, their testimony begins to assume a corelative force which is of immense importance in these problems.

Thus the 1 group, now grown quite large, shows from comparison with *syr* S that we are right in assuming the whole group to be syriac, and very old at that. It develops, however, that the MS. 46=88=101 is the purest representative of the group, followed by 59 and 62/3 which reproduce things which 46 had abandoned. And so it goes.

12, for instance, a member of the 1 group, but a trifle outside the regular ranks, comes in often in such a way that with its graeco-latin immediate derivation we are really face to face with a very old TRILINGUAL version, syriac, latin, greek running side by side, if indeed we might not go further and speak of a fourfold version embracing coptic as well. For the 34 group draws syriac, latin, and coptic very close, as do the 21 group and the 25–58–70–78–84–94 group.

34–35–68–87 savours often strongly of Latin, and then runs to καρχηδων at xxi. 19 with *copt.*†

As to *syr* Gwynn notes at ix. 17 νακινθον θειωδη, but says

---

† Besides the numerous Greek words throughout the coptic language, we must not forget that there are quite numerous LATIN words used, and used in such a way (comparatively rare as they are) as to be exceedingly suggestive of *Latin* intercourse and *Latin* influence in Egypt.

For besides graeco-latin words, as

ϩΑΚΚΟϹ (lacus, λάκκος)
ΟΥΓΓΙΑ (uncia, οὐγγία)
ΠΕϩΑΓΟϹ (pelagus, πέλαγος)

we have the extremely suggestive

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| ϹΚΡΙΒΩΝ | a messenger | (scribo) |
| ϹΤΡΑΤΑ | a street | (stratus) |
| ϕΟϹϹΑ | a fosse | (fossa) |
| ϩΟΥΞ | a general | (dux) |
| ΠΡΕΤΑ | a prison | (praeda, "a prey") |

(for all of which the Copts did not lack Egyptian synonyms)

as also

| | |
|---|---|
| ΒΙΚΤΩΡ | Victor, a proper name |
| ΒΕΡΕΤΑΡΙΟϹ | veredarius, a state-courier. |

Note also ΠΑΓΑΝΟϹ a heathen (*fr*: paien, *lat*: paganus, incola pagi).

We need hardly refer to ΚΟΥϹΤΩϩΙΑ (Matt. xxvii. 65), which, although a latinism, is imported merely *via* the Greek Testament.

literally καρχηδονα θειου. Here the coptic reads νακινθινον, but at xxi. 19 καρχηδων.

Gwynn's careful translation of the Crawford Syriac develops certain very interesting things.

When we follow 18 or 40 over the ground, we find it established beyond peradventure that *they were translating from syriac* just as Gwynn was, or using a graeco-syriac very freely. He has been even more careful than they, but the case is given away *in toto*.

In the same way, the relation to the 1–46 group, which is essentially a graeco-latin family, convinces us that simultaneously there rested under the eyes of their progenitors *both* the Syriac and the Latin versions.

Now there cannot have been a host of single retranslations from Syriac into Greek, nor from Latin into Greek. Thus, perforce, we must return ℵ 18 40 and such MSS. to a place deriving from a triglot MS.

At any rate, we establish beyond doubt that, so far from an examination of the cursives having caused us to wander about among the church recensions of X–XVI$^{th}$ centuries, we have brought the subject round, *back of* ℵ, *back of* the IV$^{th}$ century, into the light of the II$^{nd}$ and III$^{rd}$ centuries, and we can debate the matter with far greater clearness than before on that ground.

The process of proof will be submitted later in all its detail. It has been a grievous matter so to have neglected the cursives, for through their innocent but weighty grouped testimony we can really develop the history of the text throughout all the books of the New Testament.

We can properly weigh ℵ A and C in the balances, because we have found some weights as early as they themselves with which to weigh them.

There are several other MSS. which intrude sometimes, such as 3$^2$, 14–92, 8–24, 56, 61–95, 65, 67, 72, 97, 102, 106, besides 114 and 119–123. We can nearly always pick up some information from these codices. Thus at xvi. 8/9 *syr* S omits εν πυρι at the end of verse 8, and και εκαυματισθησαν οι ανθρωποι from the beginning of verse 9. Gwynn is satisfied that this is due to homoioteleuton *in the syriac*, and restores the words in his text. What do we find among the Greek MSS. which are friendly to this syriac? Why, 18 omits εν πυρι only, but 67 omits the rest. So that,

between the two MSS, we go back to this error. And so on *ad infinitum*, as will be shown in detail.

$\aleph^{gr}$ draws from this syriac recension very early, even to the order of words. It is as much syriac as coptic or Alexandrian.

$C^{gr}$ is shown to be clearly syriac, and also that hitherto rather indeterminate $P^{gr}$.

$C^{gr}$ with such syriacizers as 119–123 now almost reveal an unknown syriac lying further back even than *syr* S.

$A^{gr}$ reveals most clearly both syriac and coptic influences. In adding *και* between numerals it shows its graeco-syriac origin before it was copied in Egypt.

This is not an old story, however it may have been sketched before. For we require the evidence—to be produced *in extenso* shortly—to appreciate its bearings properly.

59 favours the purer syriac version (this is confirmed by 119–123). It also has decided coptic leanings.

62/3 favours an Egypto-syriac version.

46–88–101 writes *υδατι* for *εν αιματι* with syriac alone at viii. 7.

These members of the 1 family are very interesting to follow. The divisions among themselves of the 1 family are most significant of basic and exceedingly early syriac influence.

106 even shows us a survival of punctuation (iv. 8). Also 36.

Again, 34–35–68–87 give us *εβληθησαν* with syriac (viii. 7), a record of trouble being left by 62* with "*εβλη*."

*Lat-syr-copt* meet at i. 11 *ἁ* (*pro ὁ*) and such places.

The syriac helps us materially at xii. 10, confirming *εβληθη* of ℵCABP and many cursives, although no less than 1 10 12 14 17 23 32 36 37 46–88–101 49 55 59 62/3 67 72 77 91 96 101 oppose with *κατεβληθη* of *textus receptus*, and these are all sympathetic codices. They got it probably from their Latin affiliations *projectus est* or *praecipitatus est* instead of the usual *missus est* used elsewhere.

My examination of the Crawford Syriac and of Gwynn's translation seems to point to an original bilingual *graeco-syriac*. Otherwise Gwynn's careful translation would not yield so many divergencies unattested by the other witnesses whom we have dragged in, *viz.* 18 21 28 40 36 38 46 59 62/3 73 79 *etc.*

In other words the Crawford syr. does not seem to represent simply a syriac, but also a greek recension of equal antiquity. Otherwise these sympathetic codices would have reproduced more

of these syriacisms, *which were avoided in the original accompanying Greek version.*

Note then, that outside the errors there are forms not reproduced by *any* of our friends.

Those to which they approach (and there are a good many cases to be observed of this tendency) are due to the very use of the said bilingual by themselves.

In other words, the MS. of the syriac which has reached us is rather corrupt, as indeed can be seen from such interpolations as "a voice from the '*seventh*' Heaven" (x. 4).

I believe this graeco-syriac recension perished only since the time of 36. This MS. yields as much as or more than any of the related MSS.

As regards the ancient latin base, anyone who goes deep enough into the subject will see that it is not a question of graecizing Latin at a late date which confronts us, but pure mixture from bilingual and trilingual MSS. at the outset. Otherwise many pure Latin forms would have passed over into some Greek MSS., *whereas in many cases they have not passed into a single Greek MS.*

xviii. 4. de plaga *gig.* So, in the singular της πληγης *syr* S, while all Greeks and Graeco-Latins have εκ or απο των πληγων in the plural, and Latins *de plagis.*

12. preciosum *gig.* So *syr* S, equivalent of τιμιον for τιμιωτατον of all Greeks and Graeco-Latins. Not only is the superlative absent from *gig* and *syriac,* but the case is different, agreeing with *vas.*

17. in mari operantur *latt* for την θαλασσαν εργαζονται. So *syr* εν τη θαλασση εργ.

The above is negative. Consult the positive side:

xvi. 9. The Latin *aestu magno* found its way into the Greek καυματι μεγαλω of 18 21–28–73–79–100–103 for καυμα μεγα of all the rest. In this connection note that these being syriacizing MSS. it follows that the version was *trilingual* and not only bilingual. See note on the coptic at this place.

But at xvii. 6 the same Latin construction *miracione magna* did not overflow, θαυμα μεγα remaining unchanged (except for one graeco-latin 104, which gives the accusative θαυμαν μεγαν).

59, on the other hand, is a MS. where, *in addition to* the old

version, the scribe has allowed himself to follow Latin forms sometimes, and we cannot tell exactly whether he is translating as at xvi. 17 εις αερα (– τον) [alone among MSS.] = *in aera* of *gig* (against εις τον αερα of some and επι τον αερα of most) or rendering from a bicolumnar.

The text of *syr* S is proved beyond peradventure to be very old. So is *gigas*. Both go to 250 or earlier. Thus it becomes interesting when we want to establish the existence of a trilingual *then*, and to date a MS. like 56 (of high importance and very ancient lineage) to find 56 at the same time alone in this chapter (xvi. 14) using απασης for ολης = *universi* of *gigas* [others all *totius*].

Pure retranslation in later times goes overboard also if you consult a place like xviii. 10, 15, where neither the 16 nor 21 groups render των βασανισμων for *tormentorum*, nor do they seek to graecize *desertae factae sunt tantae deliciae* into anything else but the received ηρημωθη ο τοσουτος πλουτος, nor render *in deliciis vixerunt* but by στρηνιασαντες. Nor at xvii. 9 is the verb in "Hic *est* sensus" reproduced in any Greek MSS.

Having established the intimate relations between the Crawford Syriac and certain Greek cursives, certain cursive families, and certain individual members of these families, we return to the LATIN, and we find the same thing.

Meanwhile, for rather a pretty composite picture, see

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| i. 9. | εν ιῡ (*pr.*) | ℵCP 38 *syr* S *gig copt.* |
| ii. 5. | – ταχει | ℵCAP 56 *syr* S *gig vg copt.* |
| 9. | – τα εργα και | CAP 47 *syr* S *gig vg copt.* |
| 13. | – τα εργα σου και | ℵCAP 38 *syr* S *gig vg copt.* |

Thus the four versions run together here against all other Greek cursives.

Yet the last two omissions are not proven absolutely correct, for what of our other witnesses just as ancient, 18 40 and the rest? The matter is a hard one, for we can perfectly well do without these two clauses. Yet that very fact militates against their insertion unless they formed part of the original text, and it seems hardly credible that the twenty odd cursive MSS. which are derived from the same source as those which omit should *all* have added these clauses.

Note Latin agreement of ℵ, A as follows :—

i. 16. φαινει ως ο ηλιος by ℵ only *copt* = order of *h* and *Cypr Jul Firm.*

ix. 7. *ομοιοι* for *ομοια* by ℵ 59. *Cf.* similes *h gig vg.*
21. *εκ των φωνων* for *εκ των φονων* by ℵ* 27 35 36 56 59 78* 98 103 108. = de vocibus suis *gig.*
x. 3. *ταις εαυτων φωναις* for *τας εαυτων φωνας* by ℵ 7–45. = vocibus suis *gig syr* S.
4. *οσα* (*pro οτε*) by ℵ 37 73–79–80–103 *gig Prim.*
xiv. 3. + *ενωπιον* before *των πρεσβυτερων* by ℵ only = *syr* S *gig*, besides *χρυσεας* for *χρυσας* by ℵ (*cf. latt* aureas). [*Cf.* xxi. 6.]
xv. 3. *των αιωνων* (*pro των αγιων*) ℵ*C 18 56 95 = *syr vg.*
xvi. 14. — *εκεινης* by ℵ 38 14–92 *gig vg copt Tich.*
19. — *αυτου fin.* by ℵ only *gig copt.*
xvii. 16. — *εν* (*ante πυρι*) by ℵ 34–35–87 and PB 40 56 61 and *Latt* [*non copt sah*].
xviii. 12. *μαργαριτων* by ℵ 35 59 87 95 *syr* and *gig Prim.*
xix. 18. *επ αυτοις* by ℵ 56. *Latt* in ipsis [*non Prim Anonym*].
20. *την εικονα* by ℵ* 38 61. *Cf.* ymaginem *latt.*
xx. 1. *εν τη χειρι* by ℵ 38 *Latt syr copt.*
xxi. 3. *εσκηνωσεν* for *σκηνωσει* by ℵ only. = habitauit *am gig.*
6. *δωρεας* (*pro δωρεαν*) by ℵ* only. *Cf. lat* gratis. [*Cf.* xiv. 3.]
11. *απο του θεου* (*pro του θεου*) ℵ only. = a deo *gig* (the rest "Dei").
12. *επι τους πυλωνας* ℵ 18. = super portas *Anonym*, in portas *gig*, the rest in portis and *επι τοις πυλωσιν.*
25. *ημερα* by ℵ* only. "*die*" or "*per diem*" *latt* for *ημερας.*
v. 12. *αξιος* (*pro αξιον*) A only. dignus est agnus *Latt.*
vi. 9. —*δια sec.* A only with *copt* [*non sah*] and *Cypr Prim tol gig.*
xii. 3. *επι τας κεφ. αυτων* A 87 for *αυτου* with *gig* in capitibus *suis.*
xiv. 18. — *εξηλθεν* A 81* 100 114 with *gig* (*Prim*).
xvi. 6. *δεδωκας* (*pro εδωκας*) CA only. *Cf. latt* dedisti.
xvii. 8. *υπαγει* (*pro υπαγειν*) A 55 59 104 119 only. *Cf. Iren Prim al.* vadit, *vg gig* ibit.
xx. 5. — *δε* A only. *Cf. latt* "ceteri."
xxii. 5. *ουκ εξουσιν χριαν* A only. *Cf. latt* non egebunt.
16. *εν ταις εκκλ.* (*pro επι*) A 18 21 38 56 73 79 80 100 103 108**. = *vg gig* "in ecclesiis."
xviii. 23. — *εν* (*post φανη*) C only. *Cf.* lucebit tibi *gig Prim.*
xvii. 3. *εχοντα* ℵP only. *Cf.* habentem *latt.*

Further consider:—

iii. 19. — εαν 40 59 *vg gig Prim syr.*
ix. 3. — εξουσιαν 40 *syr* and *h.*
8. — ησαν 21 40 73 *h.*
xi. 10. χαρησονται 38 119–123; *al. omn.* χαιρουσιν *contra text. recept.* χαροῦσιν *Cf. latt.*
xii. 2. + και (*post* εχουσα) ℵC 95 *syr h gig Prim.*
xiii. 5. εξουσιαν 12 63 84 109. potestatem *gig.*
[xiii. 7 *gig* = potestas, but ℵ* 12 εξουσιαν.]
10. αποκτειναι ℵ 21 28 73 79 103 *syr gig* interficit.
xiv. 13. γαρ (*pro* δε) ℵCAP 18 26 38 95 107. *Latt* enim, *Prim* nam.
xviii. 13. θυμιαμα 1 56 62–3 72 80 95 119 *Hipp. Cf.* incensum *gig Prim.*
xix. 10. + ποιησης (*post* ορα μη) 32 95 (36) } = *Latt* "vide ne
xxii. 9. + ,, ,, ,, ,, 32 56 } feceris."
xx. 8. — τον *ante* γωγ *et* μαγωγ ℵ and some = *Latt.*
xxi. 16. ισα εισι (*pro* ισα εστι) 18 104. = *vg gig* aequalia sunt.
23. το αρνιον + εστι 41. *Latt* agnus est.
xxii. 16. και πρωινος 46–88–101 56. = et matutina *Latt.*
Many more could be cited.

*Gig* retains a number of unique "readings," many due solely to Latin construction. We cannot print them here, but they will be adduced in our work on the Apoc. to show where the Latin influenced the Greek and where it did not. The point is that the Latin influence is not late but very early.

We do not find retranslation where we might expect it. And such a thing as "λογος θεου" for ο λογος του θεου for the Latin *verbum Dei* is of the rarest occurrence [occurs only in Apoc 100 at xix. 13].

Thus, in the same chapter,

xix. 2. *De meretrice magna* for την πορνην την μεγαλην
11. *Cum justicia* ,, εν δικαιοσυνη
10. *Deum* (governed by *adora*) ,, τω θεω (προσκυνησον)

are not found transmitted to a single Greek MS. If the retranslation had been late and as it were deliberate we should find a trace of it in such places, but we do not.

More than that, what retranslation there was, was not deliberate from the Latin alone, but due to the diglot or triglot already referred to, and the trilingual was what seems to have

influenced the *earliest* Greek copyists, where they sometimes found material to elucidate matters or to help them if their Greek column was faint, or if the construction or a word bothered them, or if they were acquainted with some varieties of order or of readings.

To continue :

The Latin did not overflow in the following places :—

xix. 2. judicia ejus *sunt.*

*ibid.* quoniam *for* ὅτις.

6. — ο παντοκρατωρ *gigas.* Not one Greek copy so far omits.

7. venerunt nuptiae *for* ηλθεν ο γαμος. Surely here some of our careless Graeco-Latins might have gone astray. Not at all. So they hardly ever retranslated *wittingly.*

8. operiret *se* for the simple περιβαλειται.

12. qui accepit (*for* αυτος *fin.*).

14. purpureum (*for* καθαρον).

16. in vestimento et in femore suo (as against επι το ιματιον και επι τον μηρον αυτου).

*ibid. fin.* dominantium (*for* κυριων).

16. — το ονομα
17. — του μεγαλου } No Greeks.

19. ad faciendum (all have ποιησαι, and none του ποιησαι).

*ibid.* cum illo qui sedet (all have μετα του καθημενου).

A curious case occurs at xix. 20 where *gig* says "in stagnum ignis *ardentem* et in sulphur." The Latin follows the Greek την καιομενην agreeing with *stagnum.* Yet ℵAP 67 81 read της καιομενης not following the Latin of *gig*, but following what appears in *vg* and *Prim* as "ignis *ardentis.*"

Where the Latin *did* overflow (as at xix. 13 in 100 as shown previously), see—

xix. 2. suorum *pro* αυτου *sec.* = αυτων 103

10. eum *pro* αυτω = αυτον B

12. in capite (*pro* επι την κεφαλην) = εν τη κεφαλη 14–92

19. in equo (*pro* επι του ιππου) = εν τω ιππω 24

20. — οι δυο 75 only,

it was due to special causes, or infirmity, or wilfulness of a few scribes, where it is confined as above to single MSS.

The other points which appear are clearly, as I think, due to bilinguals, trilinguals, or even quadrilinguals in the earliest stages of copying.

Thus: xix. 3 *iterum* of *gigas* and the *Latins* found its way into 34–35–87 (the syriac-latin-Egyptian MS.) with εκ δευτερου for δευτερον. This is a most natural retranslation (δευτερον becoming *iterum* instead of *secundo*, and then reappearing not as δευτερον but as εκ δευτερου), yet it is confined to this small group, representing one MS. Very well. Let it go, if you will, as a clear retranslation from Latin. But why does it not appear in *other* Greek MSS. then? It forces this retranslation back to the earliest stages, and whether derived from Latin or Coptic † shows the versions to have been closely concurrent.

However, to show *when* scribes took little liberties, see above at xix. 10, where the Latin is *Vide ne feceris*, as also at xxii. 19. Now 32 36 95 are guilty of appropriating this *feceris* at xix. 10, but only 32 of these adds the ποιησης at xxii. 9. And 56 does it at xxii. 9, but not at xix. 10. Moreover 108** (= 56) joins 56 at xxii. 9. This second hand of 108 represents the same original as 56 (for which there is ample proof positive elsewhere).

Note the character of every one of these MSS. 32 36 56 95 are representatives among our cursives of an exceedingly ancient text. They were either using a graeco-latin bilingual or preferred to emphasize ποιησης (thinking it had dropped out), or the Latin *feceris* was so familiar that they incorporated it almost involuntarily. Both hypotheses work in the same direction. In the latter case it shows the Latin to have been as old or older than their Greek text, and in the former it shows that as the reading was not adopted by *all* these MSS. in *both* places, they were not using the Latin, but the bicolumnar, and took a liberty in one place but not in another.

Again, within the self-same limits of the one chapter xix.:

xix. 8. splendidum mundum *gig* (*Male Belsh.* splendens) = λαμπρον καθαρον (— και). This order, minus και, occurs only in ℵAP 7–39–45–102, 91 and 95. Here then we see ℵAP (syriac-greek MSS.) and 91 95 accompanied only by the members of the graeco-latin group 7–39–45–102, and we can almost see these scribes involuntarily harmonizing a trilingual.

---

† Coptic MSS. use three different expressions, one: ϥⲱⲁϩⲥⲟⲡ ⲃ̅ = "the second time."

On the other hand :

xix. 9. — του γαμου, with which the Latin of *gigas* agrees and which seems an error, is only witnessed to by the Greek MSS. ℵ*P 1–46=88=101 16–39–102 21–73–79–103 36 59–67–80–81 100 106 114 *copt* [*non sah*] *Er* 1 2 3 *Ald Col* 57, but it shows that in *a* manuscript, and that a very early polyglot, the word was missing, for, if you will digest the above group, you will find that, while imperfect, it has the elements of the Greek, Syriac, and Latin families, though witnessed to only by portions of these families, and is omitted also by *copt* but not by *sah*. As a matter of fact the words are not wholly missing in the old syriac, but are replaced by an expression equivalent to της διακονιας conveying very imperfect sense. This being the case, some ancient scribe omitted it altogether. This would perhaps make for the syriac antedating all the Greeks.

At xix. 15 *omnes* gentes is found only in 38 and 97 (+ παντα) and *sah* [*non copt*].

xix. 18. επ αυτοις (*for* επ αυτων) is found in ℵ 56. *Cf.* Latin *in ipsis*.

Summing up then (although we have only presented some of the data available, and we fear not at sufficient length), we would say that it is perfectly evident that both the old Syriac and the old Latin versions were familiar to the scribes of the Greek MSS. which we have (to some extent) reviewed. Nay, more. They were not singly but *both* part and parcel of the groundwork of their original Greek texts; and the sympathy exists in such minute matters that it would seem evident that it occurred from the use of a trilingual.

Having gone thus far, we go farther, and note from the character of the witness of the group 34–35–68–87, where we again find perfect familiarity with the old Syriac and considerable acquaintance with the old Latin, that the text flowed to Egypt in the same form of Greek-Syriac-Latin, and hence we reach the conclusion, now taking into consideration the coptic influence visible in ℵ, that a great quadrilingual polyglot existed before ℵ was written, which last-named MS. was probably penned *circa* 350–400.

ℵ itself is very strongly syriac,† so strongly that it is impossible for the text to be such as it is without the influence of a double syriac-greek version lying before the scribe or before his forerunner. And other minutiae confirm the treble origin. Take Apoc. i. 9 εν ιῡ alone by ℵCP 38 *gig* (*syr*). Now ℵ* writes ιιῡ *sic*, what but a transcription of iℏu? Again:

i. 6. βασιλειαν και ιερεις alone with *gig* is actually read by ℵ$^{a}$, so that this first corrector knew and saw the polyglot version.

The case of A is equally interesting. The *groundwork* of whatever is good in A comes from an old syriac-greek copy *before* it reached Egypt, also tinged with some old Latin influence (for a trifle see xiii. 5 with *gig* 16–39–69 95). Whatever is poor in the codex, due chiefly to carelessness, can be traced to the vicissitudes through which the text passed *after* reaching Egypt.

I came to these conclusions some years ago.

In a few months there will be unveiled the most important Greek MS. ever discovered as to the text of St. Mark. I refer to the Freer MS. It witnesses to readings so far only known in the cursive 28. And the self-same phenomena will be observed in full play in Freer as we have sketched here.

† Note where the ℵ text was also current. See two very particular places agreed to alone by ℵ and *Eustathius*, Bishop of *Antioch*, *viz.* Matt. viii. 29 απολεσαι for βασανισαι, and Luke xvi. 24 υδατι for υδατος, alone of all Greeks.

## SPECIMEN PAGES OF THE COLLATIONS OF THE GREEK MSS. OF THE APOCALYPSE.

We print the following (Apoc. xviii. 22/24) as a specimen of the manner in which the full evidence of our collations in the Apoc. is to appear. In the large number of variations naturally occurring from homoioteleuta in xviii. 22/23 the door was opened for the omission of πασης τεχνης in verse 22; yet absolutely no MSS. but ℵA omit, and this they do alone with the *bohairic* against every Greek cursive and against all Latins.

We shall be repaid for printing this if we can bring the lesson home that this makes ℵA and coptic hang together absolutely.

xviii. 22. — και φωνη κιθαρωδων *usque ad* εν σοι ετι *sec.* 65.
— και *init.* ℵ 1. (*Cf. copt.*)
φωνῆ 114. φωνην (*pro* φωνη *pr.*) 16 39 69.
κιθαραδων 12. κιθαροδων 59 104.
κιθαρας *syr* S.
αυλιτων B 7 16 32 36 39* (αυλιστων *ex emend.**) 45 72 81 102 114.
αυλιστων 69 104. αυληστων 26 [*non* 107] [*non* 108 *ut vid.*].
αβλητων 51 [*non* 90].
— και *quart.* 19.
σαλπιγγων ℵ 35 [*non* 51] 87 90. σαλπιγκτων *Hipp.*
ⲛⲉⲗⲗ ⲟⲩⲥⲁⲗⲡⲓⲧⲍ *copt.*
σαλπϊτὸν 32.
σαλπιγγος *syr* S (και σαλπιγγος και αυλητων και μουσικων *pro* και μουσ. και αυλ. και σαλπιστων).
ακουση *vel* ακουστη (*pro* ακουσθη *pr.*) 14 [*Scr.*].
ακουστη 98.
εισακουσθει 12.
εισακουσθη 46 (*q.v.*) *Ald* [*non Er.*].
ακουσθει *bis* 45.
ακουσθη σει ετι εν σοι *sic pr. loco* 69.
ετι εν σοι ετι *sic pr. loco* 78.

xviii. 22. ετι εν σοι *pr.* 61.
— εν *prim.* 98.
— εν σοι *prim.* 43 67.
— εν σοι ετι *pr. usque ad* εν σοι ετι *sec.* 14. [*Non* 92, *Habet* και πας τεχν. της κ.τ.λ. *Rel. cum t. r.*]
+ και (*ante* πασης τεχνης) 36 [*non* 51 90].
— και πας τεχνιτης *usque ad fin. vers.* 43 63 [*non* 62, *vide infra*] 102* (*suppl.*** *ut infra*) *syr.* S [*non gig*].
*Transf. ad fin. vers.* και πας τεχνιτης *usque ad* εν σοι ετι *sec.* 7 16 39 45 104.
τεχνητης 39 41 [*non* 51] 53 90 114.
*Ita* 102**: και πας τεχνιτης πασης τεχνης εν σοι μη ευρεθη (— ετι) και φωνη μύλων (*sic*) ου μη ακουσθη (— εν σοι ετι).
— πασης τεχνης ℵA *boh* (*hiat sah*). [***Non gig, non Hipp, non al.***]
+ επινοια (*post* τεχνης) 36.
τεχνοις 39.
ο μη (*pro* ου μη *sec.*) 12.
ευρεθει 7 [*non* 45] 12.
— εν *sec.* 98*.
— ου μη ευρεθη εν σοι ετι 46 (*q.v.*).
— και φωνη μυλου *ad fin. vers.* ℵ 18 19 21 [*non* 26] 29 30 35 38 41 [*male Birch*] [*non* 42] 51 53* 61 62 (63 *vide supra*) 69 72 [*non* 73 *q.v.*] 87 90 93 98 108 114.

22/23. — και πας τεχνιτης *usque ad* εν σοι ετι *prim. ver.* 23 *in* 80*; *suppl. ima pag.* 80**: και πας τεχνιτης πασης τεχνης ου μη ευρεθη εν σοι ετι, *sed* 80* *et* 80** *om.* (*ver.* 22) και φωνη μυλου ου μη ακουσθη εν σοι ετι (*ver.* 23) και φως λυχνου ου μη φανη εν σοι ετι.

22. *Post* φωνη *sec. et ante* μυλου + κιθαρωδων *in rasura* 12.
μυθου (*pro* μυλου) C.
ευρεθη (*pro* ακουσθη *sec.*) B.
φανη (*pro* ακουσθη *sec.*) 4 6 20 31 34 48 64 74 106.
ακουσθει (*pro* ακουσθη *sec.*) 7.
επι (*pro* εν *ult.*) 100.

22/23. + οι εμποροι σου οι μεγιστᾶνες. *add. inter versus* 78 *errore* [*non* 25–58–70–84–94].

22. ετοι (*pro* ετι *ult.*) 104.

xviii. 22/23 *sic*: *Post* εν σοι ετι *primo loco ver.* 22 *habet, hoc ordine, ita*: και φωνη νυμφιου και νυμφης ου μη ακουσθη εν σοι ετι, και πας τεχνιτης πασης τεχνης ου μη ευρεθη εν σοι ετι, και φως λυχνιου (*sic*) ου μη φανη εν σοι ετι οι εμποροι σου κ.τ.λ. (*i.e.* — και φωνη μυλου ου μη ακουσθη εν σοι ετι *cum* ℵ 18 19 21 29 35 38 *etc.*) **40.**

22/23 *sic*: και φωνη μυλου ου μη ακουσθη εν σοι ετι· και φωνην (*cum* ℵ* 87* 90 [*at* φωνὴ 101]) νυμφιου και νυμφης ου μη ακουσθη εν σοι ετι. και φωνη κιθαρωδων και μουσικων και αυλητων και σαλπιστων, ου μη εισακουσθη εν σοι ετι. και πας τεχνιτης πασης τεχνης (— ου μη ευρεθη εν σοι ετι), και φως λυχνου ου μη φανη εν σοι (— ετι)· οτι οι εμποροι κ.τ.λ. **46–88–101.**

22/23 *sic*: και πας τεχνιτης πασης τεχνης ου μη ευρεθη εν σοι ετι· και φωνη κιθαρωδων (*sic*) και μουσικων και αυλητων και σαλπιστων ου μη ακουσθη εν σοι ετι· και φως λυχνου ου μη φανη εν σοι ετι. και φωνη μυλου ου μη ακουσθη εν σοι ετι. και φωνη νυμφιου και νυμφης ου μη ακουσθη εν σοι ετι· οτι οι εμποροι κ.τ.λ. **59.**

[*Cum t. r.* 119–123.]

23 *init.* — και B.

φωνη (*pro* φως) 44 [*non* 52] 67.

— και φως λυχνου ου μη φανη εν σοι ετι A 26 35 41 [*male Birch*] 42 [*male Birch*] 53 57 69 77 87* 107 *Er* 1 2 3 *Ald Col.*

— και φως λυχνου ου μη φανη εν σοι ετι και φωνη νυμφιου και νυμφης ου μη ακουσθη εν σοι ετι 12 21 36 73 79 (*neglexit Tisch.*) [*non* 100] 103.

— και φωνη νυμφιου και νυμφης ου μη ακουσθη εν σοι ετι 61.

λιχνου (*pro* λυχνου) 16. λυχνιου 40.

φανει 7–45 56*?

ακουσθη (*pro* φανη) 16–39 (102? φανη *ex emend.*).

ευρεθη (*pro* φανη) 62–63 72.

— εν (*post* φανη) C *syr* S. επι (*pro* εν *prim.*) 100.

lucebit tibi adhuc *gig.*

— ετι *prim.* 46 (*q.v. supra*).

ἢ (*pro* και *sec.*) 38. *Cf. copt.*

xviii. 23. *φωνην νυμφιου* ℵ* [*φωνη* ℵ$^{a}$] 46 (*q.v.*) [*non* 51] 87* 90.
*Γαμφιου* (*pro νυμφιου*) 56** *ut vid. vitiose* (*Γαμου* 56* ?).
+ *φωνη* (*ante νυμφης*) C 19 *syr* S [*non copt*].
*νυμφις* 95. *νημφης* 104.
*ακουσθει* 56.
*ευρεθη* (*pro ακουσθη*) 62–63 72.
— *εν σοι sec.* 97.
— *ετι sec.* 80.
— *οτι prim.* 2 9 18 19 23 24 25 26 27 29 30 38 40 41 42 43 44 50 51 52 53 55 [*non* 56] 58 61 65 75 78 82 84 89 90 93 94 97 98 107 108.
*και* (*pro οτι pr.*) 22 47.
— *οι prim.* A 13 70 (*errore*) 95.
*ενποροι* B.
— *σου prim.* 9 21 27 36 73 79 100 103.
— *ησαν* 25 58 70 78 84 94.
— *οι* (*ante μεγιστανες*) 58.
*οι μεγαλη* (*sic*) *της γης μεγιστάναι* (*pro οι μεγιστανες της γης*) 104.
*μεγισταναις* 7. *μεγιστανεις* 81* ? *μεγηστανες* 72.
*μεγιστανοι* 35 41 [*non* 42 53] 87.
— *γης* 80 (*errore*).
*και* (*pro οτι sec.*) 56 119–123.
*τι* (*pro τη*) 39.
— *τη* (*ante φαρμάκεια*) 58.
*φαρμακια* ℵCAP 7 12 19 24 36 45 48 [*non* 50] 56 62*txt*(*non com.*) 63*txt et com.* 72 82* 87 103 104 114 119.
*φαρκεια* 107*.
*εν ταις φαρμακειαις* *syr* S *copt.* In veneficiis tuis *gig et latt.*
*επλανησας* 34–35–87 *syr* S.
*επλανυθησαν* 72.
*επλανηθαν* 81*.
*εθνοι* 72.
24 *init.* — *και εν αυτη* 46–88–101.
+ *τη* (*ante αυτη*) *Hipp* (*ut edit. Galland.*).
*αιματα* B 2 4 6 7 8 9 10 12 13 14 16 17 [*non* 18] 19 20 [*non* 21] 22 23 24 25 26 27 29 30 31 32 34 35 [*non* 36] 37 [*non* 38] 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48

49*txt et com.* 50 51 52 53 55 [*non* 56] 58 59 61 62–63 64 65 67 70 72 [*non* 73] 74 75 77 78 [*non* 79] [*non* 80 *txt*] 81 82 84 87 88 89 90 91 92 93? 94 95 96 97 98 [*non* 100] 101 102 104 106 107 108 109$^{gr}$ 110 114.

xviii. 24. + τωv (*ante* προφητωv) *Hipp copt.*
+ τωv (*ante* αγιωv) 19 *copt.*
ευρεθησαv 7 14 [*non* 92] 16 39 45 102 104.
ηυρεθη 12.
— τωv (*ante* εσφαγμενωv) 46 50 88 101.
εσφαγμενον 24.
εσφραγισμενωv 38 62–63 67. εσφραγιμενωv 41.
εσφραγμενωv 42 53.
+ αγιωv (*post* εσφαγμενωv) 23 55.
ενι (*pro* επι) C.

# PART II.

## Study of the Quotations extant in some of the principal Monastic Writers resident in Egypt in the IVth Century.

The date of the *Sahidic* can be left to take care of itself, and we are glad to see that in the short Postscript to the third volume of the recent edition of the Sahidic Gospels the Editor inclines still towards A.D. 188 or earlier.

But an early date for the *Bohairic* has been seriously questioned by *Guidi*, who, followed by the writer of the able article *Texts and Versions* in the *Encyclopaedia Biblica* (1903), would have the *Bohairic* descend to the VI$^{th}$ or VII$^{th}$ century!

The examples we offer of *Bohairic* influence evident in ℵ can, however, not be explained away except upon the hypothesis that ℵ influenced the bohairic version. I do not believe, however, that an unbiassed observer will be able to deduce any such thing from an examination of the matter as presented here. Had ℵ been wilfully conforming to *sah* or *boh* much more consent would be seen in ℵ. Similarly, had *boh* been copying or accommodating to or really using ℵ or A, much more of the text of these MSS. would be reproduced in the *Bohairic*.

The writer of the said article says, "Coptic is generally supposed to have become a literary language somewhat earlier [than 518 A.D.]; but that is not supported by historical evidence, *nor can it be proved from the documents we possess.*"

[On p. 110, however, of Dom Butler's elaborate Introduction to *The Lausiac History of Palladius* (vol. i.) he says:

> "These fragments [of the coptic version of the Lausiac history] are all in the *Bohairic* or northern dialect."

On p. 154 he enters into the question of the date of this bohairic *version* (for he makes out a strong case for the Greek being the original and the coptic a translation), and places the date in any event PRIOR TO A.D. 450.

It would be a very curious thing, I must say, if the Lausiac

history of Palladius were translated into coptic from Greek before the Scriptures themselves.]

We offer this study of *boh* in the *Apoc.* of ℵ as proof to the contrary ; and are prepared to submit similar proof from the other books of the N.T. in *bohairic.*

The only precise argument offered against our contention is that while *sahidic* suppresses many connecting particles, the *bohairic* follows the Greek more closely and reproduces the Greek connecting particles. This is only true to a certain extent. For the same coptic practice of eliding και can be seen in many places in *boh* just as in *sah.*

Further, the writer of the article omits to notice a most important point. Coptic is very fond of a superfluous ϫε to introduce any kind of clause, short or long, prefixing ϫε in numberless places without Greek support of any kind.† Now *boh* does this just as much as *sah,* and if *boh* had been strictly following Greek at a later period, he should have eliminated most of these cases of ϫε to accord with the theory advanced of late Alexandrian graecizing.

Further, the writer says that "the Antiochian Greek text seems never to have influenced Egypt—at least not before the x$^{th}$ century. Freedom from specifically 'Antiochian' readings is a characteristic of all forms of the Egyptian N.T."

In this connection the question is, what *is* "Antiochian" as to this standardized Textus Receptus of the IV$^{th}$ century?

For we find Antioch itself and Egypt (as represented by ℵ) very close in 325 A.D.

In *Eustathius'* scanty remains we find he agrees *alone with* ℵ in two very curious readings, viz. *Matt.* viii. 29 απολεσαι for βασανισαι (with *boh,* against *sah*), and Luke xvi. 24 υδατι for υδατος. *Eustathius* was born in Pamphylia, looking east over Cyprus to the Holy Land and Antioch, north and west toward Constantinople and Magna Graecia, and south towards Egypt and Africa : in the very heart of the textual problem as it were. Later he became Bishop of *Antioch.* He was also a bit of a textual critic himself, and gave us the number of στιχοι between John viii. 59 and x. 31 in order to refute a various reading of Origen.

---

† Coptic ϫε always represents Greek οτι, but is often found where οτι is absent.

In Luke xxiii. 43 *Eustathius* gives us the exceptional order σημερον εση μετ' εμου with C* *sah boh aeth* only, against the σημερον μετ' εμου εση of *all others* including *Latt* (*except* E = eris mecum [= probably $r_2$ which is wanting]). While in Acts (xvi. 16/19) *Eustathius* agrees with AEHLP against ℵBD, which brings the issue up squarely and puts AEHLP on an equal footing with ℵBD in the first quarter of the IV^th^ century.

(In verse 19 a most curious deviation occurs from all known authorities, for *Eustathius* writes θεασαμενοι ουν οι κυριοι της θεραπαινιδος ως εκποδων ωχετο της εργασιας αυτων ἡ ελπις, while D*d* agree in a way with this, but in other language, thus:

D ως δε ειδαν (= *syr*) οι κυριοι της πεδισκης οτι απεστερησθαι της εργασιας αυτων ης ειχαν δι αυτης.

*d* Cum vidissent domini ejus puelles quoniam ispes et reditus eorum quem habebant per ipsam.

*Gigas* is blissfully ignorant of this recension, but with *Lucifer* uses *reditus* for *quaestus* of all others except *e* "*operationis.*")

*Tertullian*, although an African of Carthage, sometimes witnesses (alone) to *boh* against *sah*, as at Apoc. ii. 22 with DABO, which is certainly interesting.

Many other hints can be picked up in *Tertullian*. Thus Matt. xii. 48 – εισιν omitted in *c k* only of Latins and 440 *Evst* 259 only of Greeks (+ the Freer MS.) is omitted twice by *Tertullian*. So some *bohairic* MSS. The place is a curious one.

Again, Matt. ix. 6, the order: αφιεναι επι της γης by *boh* (and the Freer MS.), against *sah*, is how *Tertullian* expresses it, against the other Latins.

*Cyprian* even bears some witness to *boh* against *sah* in Apoc. v. 2, where once out of twice he quotes *aperire signa* for *solvere signa* with *boh* only (against *sah*).

[The full quotation of *Cypr* is "Et vidi angelum fortem praedicantem voce magna Quis dignus est accipere librum et *aperire signa* ejus." Therefore *Cypr* is deliberately quoting v. 2 and not v. 9 where the "accipere librum et aperire signa" regularly occurs in Greek in the presbyters' song.]

An interesting place about Greek Egypt and Latin Africa is 1 Cor. xiii. 7, where *Mark the hermit* gives us παντα στεργει for παντα στεγει. This reading is not found in Greek or Coptic, but is witnessed to by *Cyprian* with DILIGIT (for *suffert*) thrice. Its origin seems complicated, for *sah* is clearly *suffert* and *boh*

ϣⲁⲥⲱⲟⲩ ⲛ̄ⲥⲏⲧ ϩⲉⲛ ⲥⲱⲃ ⲙⲡⲉⲛ, yet being confined to *Marc. mon.*, *Cypr*, and *Zeno*,† its source must be narrowed down to *something* which gave rise to it. I can only conjecture that the ⲛ̄ⲥⲏⲧ of *boh* (absent in *sah*) was confused by someone (*Cypr*?) with ⲙⲉⲛⲣⲓⲧ for *diligit*, and again later by *Marc. mon.*

We must not anticipate the edition of Freer, but we are authorized to state that *boh* was distinctly effective in the time of Freer, which shows many traces of *boh* as well as of *sah*. Consult Mark xi. 12 εις βηθανιαν (for απο βηθανιας) which *Freer* reads, alone among Greeks, with only $r_2$ of the Latins, but with *six* MSS. of the *bohairic* and one of *syr pesh*. This completely changes the sense, although *boh* retains ⲉⲃⲟⲗ. Thus: "they having come *out*" (ⲉⲃⲟⲗ) ⲉⲃⲏⲑⲁⲛⲓⲁ, for ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲉⲛ ⲃⲏⲑⲁⲛⲓⲁ.

## PACHOMIUS, MACARIUS, MARCUS MONAC., SERAPION; PALLADIUS, EVAGRIUS, ORSIESIUS, AND ISAIAH ABB.

Let us now examine the quotations occurring in the writings of the above, and see how much of interest develops.

I would hesitate to invite scholars at this late date to follow me over this ground, but that I find there is such a tendency to accept *Tisch.* viii. and *Westcott and Hort* as final arbiters, while in the former much of this evidence is overlooked, and in the latter notes are far too scarce.

In other words, we find that although *Tischendorf* does use *Macarius* and *Mark the monk*, yet he fails often to record their testimony at some of the most interesting points. Not only so, but others who have developed other coptic work are content to use the patristic quotations in *Tisch.* and not to look farther. Hence there is something to be gained to-day by a more detailed re-examination.

I could have shortened it by referring merely to apparent *boh* influence, and these passages grouped alone might have made more impression on the casual reader; but for the real student a fuller presentment is fairer and more essential to a well-balanced judgment of how far *boh* winds in and out of the testimony.

† *Tisch.* quotes *Cypr* and *Zeno* for *diligit* and adds "(στεργει?)," omitting to notice *Marc. mon.* in this connection.

Without further preface we will proceed to a consideration of the subject.

We have used Gallandius' edition throughout, which was the most convenient for the writer, and which he hopes will be equally convenient for reference to the reader.

There is one very curious place to be observed in *Pachomius*, to which I refer because the writer of the article in question says: "... with this" (the late date of *boh*) "accords the fact that the most ancient writings connected with Egyptian Christianity—the original of the Bruce papyrus, the life of S. Macarius, the Rules of S. Pachomius, *etc.*—were all in Greek."

Now it is to be observed that in quoting 1 Tim. v. 8 *Pachomius* omits *την πιστιν ηρνηται και.* The verse runs in Greek:

εἰ δέ τις τῶν ἰδίων καὶ μάλιστα τῶν οἰκείων οὐ προνοεῖ, τὴν πίστιν ἤρνηται, καὶ ἔστιν ἀπίστου χείρων.

*Bohairic:* ⲓⲥⲭⲉ ⲗⲉ ⲟⲩⲟⲛ ⲟⲩⲁⲓ ⲛ̄ⲥⲓⲫⲣⲱⲟⲩϣ ⲁⲛ ⲙⲁⲗⲓⲥⲧⲁ ⲛⲁⲣⲉⲥⲏⲓ ⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲓⲛ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲟⲩ ⲁⲥⲭⲉⲗ ⲫⲛⲁϩⲧ, ⲟⲩⲟϩ ⲥϩⲱⲟⲩ ⲉⲟⲩⲁⲑⲛⲁϩⲧ.

Now it so happens that one *boh* MS. omits the last clause from homoioteleuton, ⲛⲁϩⲧ occurring twice. It looks to me very much as if *Pachomius* had omitted the last but one *from the very same cause.* He is reported to write:

"*Si quis autem suorum et maxime domesticorum curam non habet, deterior infideli est*" (– fidem negavit et).

No one else omits, nor could it occur from similarity in Greek; yet here we see from the omission of the *boh* MS. O* *how* it could occur.

This very place is mutilated in Balestri's edition of *sah*, but looks as if the end of the verse were shortened. I do not know if Mr. Horner has a more complete text.

In this connection, turning to *Macarius*, it is curious to find in the "Rules" of "Serapion Macarius Paphnutius and the other Macarius" (A.D. 371) that 1 Tim. v. 12, 8 are combined, thus: "*Quia qui primam fidem irritam fecit est infideli deterior.*"

As regards these Rules, consult further 2 Tim. iv. 2, thus rendered:

"*Argue, obsecra, increpa,* CUM *omni patientia et doctrina.*"

Others (Latins and Greeks) have "IN."

The *bohairic* does not say "with all patience and teaching," but it does say "in all patience *with* teaching," employing the

usual coptic copula ⲛⲉⲩ instead of ⲟⲩⲟϩ. This may merit a glance in this connection, and have given rise to the reading in these Rules.

That we have to do with a graeco-copt seems to be shown at Mark x. 21 where the Rules say "Vende omnia bona tua et da pauperibus *et tolle crucem tuam* et sequere me," for the bohairic MSS. are divided here, some omitting "and take up thy cross," and some adding, with arabic marginal notes of "a gloss" or "from the Greek" (with greek ΑΝΧΓΠ and others, *against* ℵBCDΔ and *latt*). *Sah* has the addition.

I am not willing to draw more than general conclusions from Macarius' own writings, except where he repeats quotations more than once, for he is as free at times apparently as Justin or Clement of Rome, *e.g.* he inverts completely 1 Thess. v. 5, and after quoting Matt. vi. 22, Luke xi. 34, he goes on to say, as if it were a quotation :

ἔλεγεν οὖν αὐτοῖς παραγγέλλων ὁ κύριος·
"ἐὰν ὑμεῖς στῆτε καὶ μὴ παρατραπῆτε φῶς
ὄντες τοῦ κόσμου ἰδοὺ ὅλον τὸ σῶμα
πεφώτισται τοῦ κόσμου. εἰ δὲ ὑμεῖς οἱ ὄντες
φῶς σκοτισθῆτε τὸ σκότος πόσον ὁ ἔστιν
ὁ κόσμος;"

On the other hand he quotes John xiv. 21, Eph. iv. 31, vi. 12, Romans ii. 4/5, and 1 Cor. ix. 27, xv. 26, 2 Cor. v. 1 in full, word for word, with the ordinary text (which does not vary),† and then again at 2 Cor. iii. 18 with

εἰς τὴν αὐτὴν εἰκόνα μεταμορφούμενοι
(for : τὴν αὐτὴν εἰκόνα μεταμορφούμεθα)

he goes distinctly with *bohairic* :—

ⲉⲛⲱⲓⲃ† ⲙⲙⲟⲛ ⲛϩⲣⲏⲓ ϩⲉⲛ ⲧⲁⲓϩⲓⲕⲱⲛ (ⲧⲁⲓϩⲓⲕⲱⲛ).

[See beyond when quoting this again.]

And again, at 1 Cor. i. 23/24 *Macarius* (*Hom.* xi.) seems to go *exactly* with *boh* against *sah* and the Greek text of all.

---

† Equally loose are such quotations as 1 Cor. iv. 20 + εν εργω, 1 Tim. ii. 8 + πονηρων, Gal. vi. 1 — εν πνι πραοτητος, Phil. ii. 12 — και τρομου, Hebr. vi. 4 της χαριτος του θεου for της δωρεας της επουρανιου, Luke xiv. 18 καλων τους θελοντας. He combines synoptic passages also as Luke vi. 29, Matt. v. 40, or runs 1 Cor. xv. 49, Rom. viii. 29, vi. 22, Jo. iv. 24 together, and Col. ii. 17 with Hebr. x. 1, and writes αγαθοι και χρηστοι for οικτιρμονες (Luke vi. 36).

The Greek is:

[23] ἡμεῖς δὲ κηρύσσομεν Χριστὸν ἐσταυρωμένον,
Ἰουδαίοις μὲν σκάνδαλον, Ἕλλησι δὲ μωρίαν·
[24] αὐτοῖς δὲ τοῖς κλητοῖς, Ἰουδαίοις τε καὶ
Ἕλλησι, Χριστὸν Θεοῦ δύναμιν καὶ Θεοῦ
σοφίαν.

*Macarius:*

ἡμεῖς δὲ κηρύσσομεν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν, καὶ τοῦτον
ἐσταυρωμένον, Ἰουδαίοις μὲν σκάνδαλον, Ἕλλησι
δὲ μωρίαν, ἡμῖν δὲ τοῖς σωζομένοις Χριστὸν
Θεοῦ δύναμιν, καὶ Θεοῦ σοφίαν.

*Bohairic:*

[23] ⲁⲛⲟⲛ ⲇⲉ ⲧⲉⲛϩⲓⲱⲓϣ ⲙ̅ⲡ̅ⲭ̅ⲥ̅ ⲉⲁⲩⲁϣϥ ⲛⲓⲓⲟⲩⲇⲁⲓ ⲙⲉⲛ
ⲟⲩⲥⲕⲁⲛⲇⲁⲗⲟⲛ ⲛⲱⲟⲩ ⲡⲉ ⲛⲓⲉⲑⲛⲟⲥ ⲇⲉ ⲟⲩⲙⲉⲧⲥⲟⲝ ⲡⲉ
[24] ⲛⲁⲛ ⲇⲉ ⲁⲛⲟⲛ ⲫⲁ ⲛⲏ ⲉⲑⲛⲁⲛⲟϩⲉⲙ ⲛⲓⲓⲟⲩⲇⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲙ
ⲛⲓⲟⲩⲉⲓⲛⲓⲛ ⲡ̅ⲭ̅ⲥ̅ ⲟⲩⲭⲟⲙ ⲛ̅ⲧⲉ ⲫ̅ⲧ̅ ⲡⲉ ⲛⲉⲙ ⲟⲩⲥⲟⲫⲓⲁ
ⲛ̅ⲧⲉ ⲫ̅ⲧ̅

That is to say: "*But we proclaim Christ crucified: the Jews indeed it is a scandal to them, but (to) the Gentiles it is a foolishness; but to us namely those who will be* SAVED, *the Jews and the Greeks, Christ is a power of God and a wisdom of God.*"

The use of ⲛⲟϩⲉⲙ (for ⲑⲱϩⲉⲙ) against κλητοις is here definitely marked as tying *Macarius* to *bohairic*.

*Sah* is extant here and can be consulted. It differs, using ⲧⲁϩⲙ̅ (= ⲑⲱϩⲉⲙ in *bohairic*) instead of ⲛⲟⲩϩⲙ̅ to correspond with ⲛⲟϩⲉⲙ.

It will be observed that the *boh* and *sah* words for *saved* and *called* are very similar.

I do not know of anyone else who agrees with *Macarius* and *boh* in substituting σωζομενοις for κλητοις here. [See beyond again in *Macar*, "de caritate."]

The question of Upper and Lower Egypt is thus brought to the fore. The high state of civilization at Oxyrynchus shows conclusively how free was the intercourse between the whole of the Nile district covered by the three coptic dialects. The questions at issue here are not particularly complicated by the various hermits of the name of Macarius. But they were all doubtless schoolmen of Alexandria in their youth. What Bibles they used we can only gather in a roundabout way from their literary

remains (which may be confused, and to this day ill-associated with one or other of the same name); but the fact remains that the *bohairic* intrudes in a way which seems to smooth over differences between the Thebaid and Alexandria, although as to *Macarius magnus* we must suppose that his dialect was *bohairic*, geographically speaking.

[But our comparisons must be wide-reaching. Overmuch has been made historically of geographical divisions and boundaries. The circulation of the scriptures overleaped *all* boundaries! It has been pointed out to me by a friendly critic that Greek Egypt and Latin Africa were as wide apart as the poles, in customs, in government, in thought. All I can say is, that in my humble position as a student of the letter of the Greek and of the Versions and of Patristic citations, evidence accumulates as to the inter-relation of the Versions which goes far to show that commercial intercourse carried with it the scriptures, and *exchanged them* in various tongues as regards the foreign element residing in different ports. And *how* free intercourse was in the old days anyone can judge from the mass of testimony which has reached us. For Greek Egypt and Latin Africa were in close touch, and as a matter of fact it has been pointed out to me that the course of *art* followed this route: Egypt,–Africa,–Spain,–Ireland!]

After a long time, with free and careful quotations alternating, we seem to get a genuine recollection of coptic order (*Hom.* xxvii.) in 1 Tim. i. 5, where (the rest of the quotation being quite regular) we get the order εκ καρδιας καθαρας by *Macarius* with both *boh* and *sah*, against all Greeks: εκ καθαρας καρδιας. I call attention to it, because it seems as if we could hear him thinking aloud.

Just as (same *Hom.*) where *Macarius* writes (Eph. vi. 11) την πανοπλιαν του πνευματος for την παν. του θεου, a rapid glance at *sah*† shows

†ⲥⲓ
ⲱⲧⲧⲏⲩⲧⲛ ⲛ̅ⲧⲡⲁⲛ
ⲥⲟⲡⲗⲓⲁ ⲙ̅ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ

where ⲙ̅ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ might be confused for του πνευματος, a very slight difference accounting for it to the eye in the sahidic column. The reading has no other authority.

---

† He is quoting most freely all the time from Ephesians, and may have had it open before him. Ephesians has reached us in its entirety both in *sah* and *boh*.

Similarly *Macarius* quotes from Heb. vi. 4 immediately below, reading της δωρεας του θεου for της δωρ. της επουρανιου, which might also be confused.

But now comes a quotation from John x. 1 in a form which seems pretty conclusive for coptic influence. Instead of saying: ὁ μὴ εἰσερχόμενος διὰ τῆς θύρας εἰς τὴν αὐλὴν, *Macarius* says:

ὁ μὴ διὰ τῆς εἰσόδου εἰσέρχομενος

rendered by his Latin translator:

"qui *per ingressum* non intrat"

exactly as Horner for *boh*: "that he who cometh not in *through the entrance*."

The *boh* (and *sah*) is ⲡⲓⲣⲟ, not using any transliteration of the Greek but a pure coptic expression ⲣⲟ "entrance." In *vv.* 7 and 9 Greek repeats θυρα, while *boh* differentiates from ⲣⲟ with the word ⲥⲃⲉ. (*Sah* substitutes "shepherd" for "door" in verse 7, and repeats ⲣⲟ in verse 9.)

I submit that this is interesting when we find *Macarius* using δια της εισοδου and *boh* ⲡⲓⲣⲟ in verse 1, and ⲡⲓⲥⲃⲉ in verses 7 and 9.

Compare also a small place in the important verse 1 Cor. ii. 9, where *Macarius* uses ὅσα for ἅ (ὅσα ἡτοίμασεν ὁ Θεὸς τοῖς ἀγαπῶσιν αὐτόν) with only ABC of Greeks but with *Clem*ro *Hipp Cyr Epiph Cyr* (both) and as it would seem the coptic.

Again a small place 2 Cor. iii. 17. For "οὗ δὲ τὸ πνεῦμα κυρίου ἐλευθερία" Macarius uses ὅπου. No Greeks do this except FG, and Tischendorf calls attention to it in Rom. iv. 15, v. 20, as well, where no Greeks vary οὗ except FG again. But *boh* is very definite: ⲡⲓⲙⲁ ⲉⲧⲉ (*sah* not extant in Balestri).

Rather an interesting place occurs in *Hom.* xlii.

As *Macarius* has been quoting rather loosely in the neighbourhood, I would not call attention to it, but that it seems to have a special significance. Referring to Luke vi. 36, Matt. xv. 11, *Macarius* says: "γίνεσθε χρηστοὶ [always this play on χριστος wherever he uses these passages instead of οἰκτίρμονες] ὡς ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν ὁ οὐράνιος· τὸ γὰρ βλάπτον καὶ μιαῖνον τὸν ἄνθρωπον, ἔνδοθέν ἐστιν· ἐκ γὰρ τῆς καρδίας ἐκπορεύονται διαλογισμοὶ πονηροὶ."

Now the Greek merely says κοινοῖ τὸν ἄνθρωπον twice over. *Latt*: "communicat" or "coinquinat." But the coptic (*boh* and *sah*) is explicit with *defile* (ⲡⲉⲧⲥⲱϥ) in both places. Therefore *Macarius* supplies βλαπτον and μιαινον. The word βλαπτω only

occurs in Luke iv. 35 and Mark xvi. 18 in other connections, and μιαινω in the Gospels only in John xviii. 28 in another connection. Surely coptic ϣϣϥ may be responsible here for βλαπτον και μιαινον.

Again, right after it, *Macarius* quotes Matt. vi. 21, Luke xii. 34, as "ὅπου ὁ νοῦς σου, ἐκεῖ καὶ ὁ θησαυρὸς σου." In all Latins *cor* is used, as καρδια among all Greeks and ϩⲏⲧ in both coptics; indeed ϩⲏⲧ is used for νους by *copt* in all the 21 places where νους occurs in Greek:

Rom. i. 28. God delivered them unto a reprobate *heart.*
vii. 23. against the law of my *heart.*
25. So then I in my *heart* indeed am servant to the law.
xi. 34. For who knew the *heart* of the Lord.
xiv. 5. Let each one be persuaded in his own *heart.*
1 Cor. i. 10. but that ye may be made perfect in one *heart.*
ii. 16. For who knew the *heart* of the Lord?
xiv. 14, 15. my *heart* is unfruitful . . . . I shall pray in the *heart* also.
Eph. iv. 17. as the Gentiles walk in vanity of their *heart.*
23. that ye may become new in the spirit of your *heart.*
Col. ii. 18. being proud without cause by *heart* of his flesh.
Tit. i. 15. but their *heart* was defiled and their conscience.
Apoc. xiii. 18. He who hath *heart* let him reckon the number.
xvii. 9. He who hath *heart* and wisdom.
1 Tim. vi. 5. Men having their *heart* corrupt.
2 Tim. iii. 8. men whose *heart* is corrupt.
Luke xxiv. 45. Then he opened their *heart* to make them understand.

In Rom. xii. 2, 2 Thess. ii. 2, 1 Cor. xiv. 19, a different word is used in *boh* (ⲡⲓⲕⲁϯ), but *sah* holds ϩⲏⲧ.

(In Phil. iv. 7 the conjunction of τας καρδιας υμων και τα νοηματα υμων is expressed by *boh* and *sah* with ⲉⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛϩⲏⲧ ⲛⲉⲙⲙ ⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲙⲉⲩⲓ.)

I submit that *Macarius*' variation of νους for καρδια shows the retranslation of one familiar with coptic and greek.

[It may be noted that *Justin* also uses νους.]

At Matt. vi. 31/32, although *Macarius* turns the phrase, using φαγητε πιητε and περιβαλλησθε for φαγωμεν πιωμεν and περι-

βαλωμεθα, it is noteworthy that he continues with verse 32 ταυτα γαρ παντα against all Greeks παντα γαρ ταυτα (but Δ) and distinctly with *copt* and *sah* "ⲛⲁⲓ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ," which is also the way most Latins turn it (*a b k Cypr* omit παντα).

Note that, going back to verse 25 immediately after, *Macarius* substitutes τιμιωτερον for πλειον. *Cf. boh* ⲟⲩⲟⲧ and *sah* ⲟⲩⲟⲧⲃ̄, which in retranslation might be rendered in a variety of ways.

The following is a small matter. 1 Tim. v. 6. Contrary to custom *Macarius* introduces this verse with ὅτι. *Greek, boh,* and *sah* have δε, but possibly, if consulting the book (and he quotes much from Timothy), his eye may have thought ⲗⲉ was ⲭⲉ, for elsewhere many others have fallen into this mistake. ⲭⲉ is absent here from coptic, but it is present so often that as a coptic form *Macarius* may well be excused for using it, and accused of a mental attitude involving it.

The quotations in the Homilies close with Matt. vii. 11, where πνευμα αγιον replaces αγαθα against coptic, merging the quotation with Luke xi. 13.

Macarius is one of those men who are the despair of textual critics. Just as you think you are going to tie him down to give valuable evidence, he continues to quote freely from memory. I must admit that his testimony is difficult to balance. He is one who was deeply versed in the Scriptures, and therefore quotes most often without a reference. He must have known Timothy and Ephesians practically by heart,† and I can hardly ever tell if he is copying. Some quotations are word for word as in the MSS., others very free or combined. Still, the very fact of memorial quotations lends force to σωζομενοις in 1 Cor. i. 24, εισοδου in John x. 1, βλαπτον και μιαινον in Luke vi. 36, Matt. xv. 11, and νους Matt. vi. 21, Luke xii. 34, ταυτα γαρ παντα in Matt. vi. 32.

What should have been the work of two or three hours, however, has extended to three or four days on this testimony of Macarius.

Passing to Macar. Magn. *De custodia cordis* we find in Eph. iv. 31 two clauses elided out of five. He omits και θυμος and και βλασφημια. Only one *boh* MS. apparently omits και βλασφημια but with it goes και κραυγη too *ex homoiotel.* *Sah* has the clauses in full.

---

† As Mark the Monk, we are informed from his companions' testimony.

Next in "*De perfectione in spiritu*" we notice in John v. 44 *Macar* has πιστιν εχειν for πιστευσαι [*boh* = ⲉⲡⲁϩⲧ, but *sah* ⲉⲧⲉⲧⲛⲁϣⲡⲓⲥⲧⲉⲩⲉ], and ζητουντες (with ℵ* some cursives, *e l Ephr Bas Chr Aug Marc mon Evagr*). He quotes this passage twice, the second time retaining ζητουντες *fin.*, but substituting πιστευειν for πιστιν εχειν. This gives one a very good idea what to expect.

So far no clue. But now we come to a decisive one. *Macarius* with *boh*, against *sah* and all Greeks, introduces an αλλο into 1 Cor. x. 31 [Galland., p. 171, wrongly indexed at foot 1 Cor. v. 31], writing:

> εἰτε γαρ φησιν εσθιετε ειτε πινετε ειτε τι αλλο ποιειτε εις δοξαν Θεου ποιειτε.

This is the exact equivalent of the *bohairic* ⲛ̄ⲕⲉϩⲱⲃ. It is true that the Vulgate with the MS. *lux*, and *Aug* 1/2 *Hil* add *aliud*, and it is *possible* that Macarius' Greek text is corrupt, but I have not so far found a case where the Latin translator *added* anything to the Greek, although he sometimes mistranslates to conform to the usual Latin reading. Unless therefore scholars can show Macarius' Gk text to have been tampered with here, we have a distinct record of *bohairic* influence against *sahidic* and *Greek*.

While there is hardly any excuse for *Macarius*' largely amplified quotation of Matt. xx. 27:

> ὁ θελων εν υμιν πρωτος ειναι και μεγας εστω παντων διακονος, και εσχατος και δουλος,

yet the *boh* expression ⲉⲑⲟⲩⲱϣ and *sah* ⲡⲉⲧⲛⲁⲟⲩⲱϣ might very well be expressed here πρωτος και μεγας as well as either πρωτος *or* μεγας; but the addition of παντων seems only to occur in Greek M (*ex* Mark ix. 35). In fact we see from *Macarius*' addition of και εσχατος και δουλος that he had St. Mark's version in mind. In St. Mark the same coptic word occurs for πρωτος. Hence while *Macarius* thus admits combining St. Matthew and St. Mark, we see perhaps a glimmer of coptic behind πρωτος ειναι και μεγας.

That our point is well taken is illustrated by Horner, who translates his *boh* in both Matt. and Mark "first," but his *sahidic* in Matt. "*first*" and in Mark "*great*"!

We pass now to *De oratione*:

In Luke xviii. 7 for the second time *Macarius* elides των εκλεκτων, yet we find no authority for this.

Rather a curious change of order occurs next at Matt. x. 42 where *Macarius* says ὁς αν ποτιση ποτηριον ψυχρου μονον εις ονομα

μαθητου αμην λεγω υμιν ου μη απολεσει τον μισθον αυτου. It is no fragmentary quotation, and yet he transfers "a cup of cold water" to a place early in the verse, against all Greeks and Latins and Coptic, *but with syr* S (and *Aug* once)!

*Macarius* supplements this quotation with one from Matt. xxv. 40, writing εφ οσον ενι τουτο εποιησατε εμοι ποιησατε.

It will be noticed that he shortens it by omitting τουτων των αδελφων μου, but adds τουτο. Now *sah*'s verb involves this τουτο, and *boh* involves ταυτα, as translated respectively by Horner.

An illustration of how free *Macarius* is at the same time (making deductions precarious unless the matter appear very clear) is found next at 2 Thess. iii. 10 (again wrongly indexed in Galland.; his index at foot is not always reliable) where *Macarius* simply says ὁ δὲ ἀργὸς μηδὲ ἐσθιέτω for ὅτι εἴ τις οὐ θέλει ἐργάζεσθαι of *Greek*, *Latin*, and *Copt.*

We may notice that *Macarius* substitutes εἴη for ἔσται after μήποτε in Heb. iii. 12, as the Latins "*sit.*"

Follows immediately a long quotation embracing Heb. iii. 16–iv. 3, iv. 11, in which the only differences are:

iii. 16. + αυτου *post* ακουσαντες.

19. μη *pro* ουκ.

iv. 1. δοκει *pro* δοκη.

11. περιπεση *pro* πεση.

This περιπεση is noticeable (Latins *cadat* or *incidat*) because *boh* is very deliberate with ϩⲉⲓ ⲉϥⲣⲏⲓ (fall *down*), while other *boh* MSS. say ⲛ̄ϥⲣⲏⲓ (fall *down*), one ⲉϩⲣⲏⲓ (fall *over* or fall *on*), and one ⲛ̄ϩⲣⲏⲓ (fall *up*?). So that really there is an excuse for περι!

[*Sah* not extant in Balestri. *Sah* Horner "fall in."]

Follows a quotation from Heb. x. 22 without variation, and then one from Heb. ix. 14 where ὃς διὰ πνεύματος αἰωνίου ἑαυτὸν προσήνεγκεν ἄμωμον τῷ Θεῷ is entirely left out (no doubt by design) but which ends + καὶ ἀληθινῷ after Θεῷ ζῶντι (as edited by Lachmann in his N.T.) WITH BOH and only Greek AP 21* 31 66 *mg Chrys Thphyl* ("*Ex* Thess. i. 9" as Tischendorf says). [*Sah* not extant in Balestri.]

I do not think that it will do to say that *boh* got this from *Macarius*, because *Macarius* is quoting at length (he quotes twelve verses in Hebrews on one page of Gallandius), and although he chose to elide a whole clause in ix. 14, I should think from his lengthy running quotation of Heb. iii. 16–iv. 3 covering seven

whole verses that he had the book open before him and *saw* ⲉⲑⲣⲉⲡⲉⲣⲃⲱⲕ ⲙ̅ⲡⲫ† ⲉⲧⲟⲛⲑ ⲟⲩⲟⲩ ⲛ̅ⲑⲙⲙⲏ.

The last quotation in this work of *Macarius* is from Luke x. 41 *fin.*/42, which agrees verbatim with the printed Greek textus receptus.

In the following *De patientia et discretione* we may notice:

Rom. viii. 28. *Macarius* supplies το before αγαθον as Greek L some curs. *Clem Orig* 1/6 *Ephr Cyr* 1/2 *Thdrt Antioch Thphyl* against the rest of the Greek uncials.

*Boh* turns it, saying "in all good things" ϩⲉⲛ ϩⲱⲃ ⲛⲓⲃⲉⲛ ⲉⲑⲛⲁⲛⲉⲩ, and *sah* ϩⲛ̅ ϩⲱⲃ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲉⲡⲁⲅⲁⲑⲟⲛ "in everything for the good," both emphasizing however *every* good thing. [Quotation repeated again in the same form in *De libertate mentis*.]

1 Cor. x. 13. Long quotation. Only difference γαρ *pro* δε after πιστος, which some *boh* omit; and omits υμας before υπενεγκειν with the large majority of Greeks; but *copt* has a longer turn of phrase.

Matt. xxi. 22 is thus given:

οτι παν ο εαν αιτησητε με εν προσευχη πιστευοντες ληψεσθε.

The ordinary Gk text is

και παντα οσα αν αιτησητε εν τη προσευχη πιστευοντες ληψεσθε.

Now this passage is rather interesting, for *boh* and *sah* divide squarely and *boh* is with *Macar* against *sah*.

At first παν ο for παντα οσα might be passed over, but both coptics give almost the equivalent, *boh* ϩⲱⲃ ⲛⲓⲃⲉⲛ and *sah* ϩⲱⲃ ⲛⲓⲙ, but while *boh* says "in *a* prayer" ϩⲉⲛ ⲟⲩⲡⲣⲟⲥⲉⲩⲭⲏ, with *Macarius*, *sah* says "in *the* prayer" ϩⲙ̅ ⲡⲉϣⲁⲗⲏ, or (other MSS.) "in *your* prayer" ϩⲙ̅ ⲡⲉⲧⲛ̅ϣⲁⲗⲏ. These little things are worth notice.

1 Cor. xiii. 8. This short quotation "ειτε γλωσσαι καταργηθησονται ειτε προφητεια" can be passed; it is a merger. *Boh* and *sah* agree with the Greek.

1 Cor. xiii. 11. οτε γαρ γεγονα ανηρ κατηργησα τα του νηπιου. Here again there is nothing to notice particularly. Gallandius prints κατηργησα for κατηργηκα of text.

2 Cor. xii. 7 agrees with usual Greek text as does *Palladius*, not supplying εν before τη σαρκι as does *copt*.

2 Cor. xi. 14. (ει γαρ και κατα τον αποστολον) "οιδεν ο σατανας εις αγγελον φωτος μετασχηματιζεσθαι." This is only a

free rendering of *και ου θαυμαστον αυτος γαρ ο σατανας μετασχηματιζεται εις αγγελον φωτος.*

1 Cor. xv. 50. *οτι σαρξ και αιμα βασιλειαν Θεοῦ ου κληρονομησουσι.* This is more important. It does not follow the coptic order (*boh* only extant) of *ου κληρονομήσουσι την βασιλειαν του Θεου*, but it conveys the coptic exactly, substituting *κληρονομησουσι* for *κληρονομησαι ου δυνανται* as do Greek FG (against the rest) with *Iren*$^{int}$ 2/5 *Orig*$^{int}$ *Tert bis* and some Latins *f g Hier Aug Sedul*, and also *Isai Abb* 1/2.

Again, following very soon (with free quotations from 1 Cor. i. 23, 2 Cor. vi. 16 in between) we reach another conclusive place :

Heb. v. 7. Although inverting the order freely *Macarius* uses *ρυσασθαι* for *σωζειν*, a notable change. *Ambrose* for *salvum facere* says *liberare*, but one old latin MS. *eliberare*, and *boh :* ⲉⲛⲁϩⲙⲉϥ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲉⲛ ϥⲙⲟⲩ [*sah* wanting] exactly *eliberare* or *ρυσασθαι.*

Follows 2 Cor. x. 5 without variation.

And next John viii. 44 where *Macar* elides *εκ πατρος του διαβολου εστε και*, writing *υμεις (ελεγε) τας επιθυμιας του πατρος υμων θελετε ποιειν* and then supplies *του ανθρωποκτονου*, apparently without authority. Continuing : *εκεινος γαρ ανθρωποκτονος εστιν αρχηθεν·* for *ην απαρχης*, and closing : *και εν τη αληθεια ουχ εστηκεν.* This *εστιν* is only supported by some three greek cursives *syr pesh Iren*$^{int}$ and *Didymus*, but *boh* and *sah* have *ην*, although three *boh* MSS. omit ⲡⲉ altogether.

As regards unique *αρχηθεν* for *απ αρχης* note *boh* has it also practically in one word : ⲓⲥⲭⲉⲛϩ (against *sah*) as at John i. 2.

Matt. xvi. 24 follows next, word for word with the ordinary Gk text ; and, separated only by *και παλιν* :

Luke xiv. 26. *εαν μητις μισηση πατερα και μητερα και αδελφους και γυναικα και τεκνα ετι δε και την εαυτου ψυχην ου δυναται μου ειναι μαθητης,*

from which it will be seen how one quotation will differ from another in accuracy, for this is undoubtedly a quotation from Luke. It does not range with coptic or Greek properly. Both *sah* and *boh* prefix possessive pronouns to all the relations, and the Greek has the articles.

The next, Acts xiv. 22, is regular except that *Macar* varies the

order to εις την βασ. του Θεου εισελθειν against Greek and *boh* (*sah* not extant).

Next follows the tract *De elevatione mentis* in which we find in the opening quotation

2 Cor. iii. 18 an interesting matter to discuss, for this is the second time *Macarius* quotes this verse; previously in the v^th^ homily where we called attention to his εις την αυτην εικονα (so *boh*) which he repeats here. But this is not all, for he repeats his quotation precisely in the same way, not only agreeing with *boh*, but actually explaining as he did before ανακεκαλυμμενω. He quotes thus:

"ημεις γαρ (φησιν) ανακεκαλυμμενω προσωπω (τουτεστιν εν τω εσω ανθρωπω) την δοξαν Κυριου κατοπτριζομεθα (as *boh* for κατοπτριζομενοι with *Orig*^int^) εις (with *boh* alone) την αυτην εικονα μεταμορφουμενοι (as *boh* for μεταμορφουμεθα with *Orig*^int^) απο δοξης εις δοξαν."

The only difference then between *boh* and *Macar* is in the omission by *Macar* of παντες at the beginning of the verse.

[*Isaiah Abb.* also has "*in* eamdem imaginem" with some *Latt.*]

Next in Luke xi. 8 we have αναστας for εγερθεις, but this is hardly retranslation but a reflection of αναστας earlier in the verse (yet *boh* and *sah* use the *same* word twice). *Macar* also writes οσου for οσων apparently alone, but compare *vg c etc. quotquot*; *quantum* of *d r*, οσον ℵ^c^DEFGHLSUVXΓΔΛ *sah*?

In Luke xviii. 7 *Macar* again omits των εκλεκτων αυτων from his quotation.

2 Cor. vi. 14. It is noticeable that *Macar* quotes

τις γαρ ἡ κοινωνια φωτι προς σκοτος.

In this way he halves his sympathy between Gk and coptic; for *boh* says ⲓⲉ ⲟⲩ ⲧⲉ ⲧⲙⲉⲧⲥⲱϥⲣ ⲙ̀ⲡⲓⲟⲩⲱⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲙ ⲡⲓⲭⲁⲕⲓ, or: "what is *the* fellowship [*Gr.* κοινωνια *absque* ἡ] of *the* light with *the* darkness." No Greeks add the article to κοινωνια.

I wish *Macarius* had quoted the whole verse, for there is a key here, as *boh* uses the same word ⲧⲙⲉⲧⲥⲱϥⲣ twice for μετοχη and κοινωνια. (All the Latins differentiate.)

In *De caritate.*

After a brief reference to 1 Cor. i. 21 του κηρυγματος μωρια, *Macar* passes to a composite quotation of 1 Cor. i. 18/23/24, thus:

"ο γαρ σταυρος" (φησιν ο Παυλος) "του Χριστου τοις μεν

*Ιουδαιοις σκανδαλον Ελλησι δε μωρια ημιν δε τοις σωζομενοις Θεου δυναμις και Θεου σοφια.*"

The language of verse 18 is *ο λογος γαρ του σταυρου* and of verse 23 *ημεις δε κηρυσσομεν Χριστον εσταυρωμενον Ιουδαιοις μεν σκανδαλον κ.τ.λ.*, so that *Macar* is combining both verses with his *ο γαρ σταυρος του Χριστου.*

The important part to be observed is this, that while in the Greek text of verse 18 *σωζομενοις* is used (*ο λογος γαρ ο του σταυρου τοις μεν απολλυμενοις μωρια εστι τοις δε σωζομενοις ημιν δυναμις Θεου εστι*), in verse 24 the Greek uses *κλητοις*, and it is from verse 23/24 that *Macar* is quoting, for he ends with *Θεου δυναμις και Θεου σοφια* instead of as verse 18 only *δυναμις Θεου εστι.*

Now *boh*, as pointed out before, uses ⲉⲑⲡⲁⲣⲟⲍⲉⲙ = *σωζομενοις* both in verse 24 and verse 18. That *Macar* quotes *twice*, using *σωζομενοις* each time in verse 24, is significant. [See above on *Hom.* xi.]

It may also be pointed out that while in *Hom.* xi. *Macar* uses the Greek terminology *Θεου δυναμιν και Θεου σοφιαν*, here he says (and his editors seem to represent him faithfully) *Θεου δυναμις και Θεου σοφια.*

Now if you will consult the coptic you will see that this *σοφια* shows plainly to the eye: ⲟⲩⲭⲟⲙ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉ ⲫ† ⲡⲉ ⲙⲉⲙ ⲟⲩⲥⲟⲫⲓⲁ.

1 Cor. iv. 8 follows without variation, and also part of Phil. ii. 7 exactly, and part of 2 Cor. iv. 7 more freely, and 1 Cor. i. 30 exactly.

John xiv. 21. *Macarius* elides *με* without authority, saying *και γαρ ο αγαπων (φησιν) αγαπηθησεται κ.τ.λ.*

He passes to verse 23, saying (*και εν αλλοις*) *εγω και ο πατηρ ελευσομεθα και μονην παρ αυτω ποιησομεν.*

This is almost permissibly free. Note that it ends with *ποιησομεν* against *ποιησω* in the quotation in *Hom.* xxxviii., which was also free, and merely said:

*οτι εμφανισω αυτω εμαυτον και μονην παρ αυτω ποιησω.*

This *ποιησω* is found in $D^{gr}$ *d e syr cu.* *Macar* uses it because he here makes a *saltus* from ver. 21 to ver. 23. [See renewed quotation of this beyond.]

Eph. iii. 19. Twice before *Macar* has quoted this. Once in full and properly on *Hom.* xlvi., and once as here (on *Hom.* xviii.): *ινα πληρωθητε εις παν το πληρωμα του Χριστου*

without authority, apparently confusing *Χριστου* for *Θεου* with *Χριστου* in the preceding clause.

He follows it with *και παλιν* and a quotation of:

Eph. iv. 30, where he passes from *μεχρι καταντησωμεν* (eliding *οι παντες . . . του Θεου*) to his favourite quotation "*εις μετρον ηλικιας του πληρωματος του Χριστου.*"

He now goes back to John xiv. 26 which he quotes from *ο δε παρακλητος* to *παντα*, but prefixes: "*υπαγω,*" *ελεγεν*, (from xvi. 5, for his mind is running on ch. xvi. as he follows at once with a quotation from xvi. 12).

The only difference in xiv. 26 here is that he gives *πατηρ* for *ὁ πατηρ*. While in coptic the article is present, yet the article itself spells ϕιωτ or πειωτ, without it the word being ιωτ or ειωτ, so that to the ear of a graeco-copt πιωτ would sound like *πατηρ*. I do not think this is far-fetched. We can only be *gleaners* in this betrampled field.

John xvi. 12/13 now follows word for word with the text.

Then Rom. viii. 26: *καθ ο δει ουκ οιδαμεν· αλλ αυτο πνευμα (— το) εντυγχανει (pro υπερεντυγχανει) υπερ ημων στεναγμοις αλαλητοις.*

*— το* before *πνευμα* appears gratuitous (*copt* ⲡⲓⲡⲛⲁ). *υπερ ημων* omitted by Greek ℵ*ABDFG *d* g Orig Epiph Dam Aug* is present here with *copt.*

*εντυγχανει* is read by Gk 54 238 *Ephr Chr.*

*Copt* supplies *εν* before *στεναγμοις* but no Greeks nor *Macar.*

1 Cor. ii. 11 follows practically without variation.

Next follows:

"*ου γαρ χρειαν εχουσι (ϕησιν) οι υγιαινοντες ιατρου αλλ' οι κακως εχοντες.*"

This is from Luke v. 31 (= Matt. ix. 12, Mark ii. 17, with *ισχυοντες*) and is interesting because *Palladius* also uses *υγιαινοντες*. [See beyond on *Pallad.* as to *coptic.*]

*Macar* next refers to Phil. iii. 20, as often previously, and then quotes 1 Cor. ii. 9 verbatim, passing to verse 10 thus: *εἶτα ἐπάγει "ημιν δε απεκαλυψε δια του πνευματος αυτου,"* eliding *ο Θεος*, but this is quite natural.

1 Cor. iv. 9. In this quotation: "*θεατρον*" (*γαρ ϕησιν*) "*εγενηθημεν και αγγελοις και ανθρωποις*" he elides *τω κοσμω* after *εγενηθημεν.*

This is merely free. The coptic has it (*sah* not extant).

1 Cor. ii. 6/7 follows in full to εν μυστηριω.

Note that *Macar* uses the order σοφιαν Θεου with *copt* (and the common Greek text with $L^{gr}$ and *syr*) against Θεου σοφιαν of ℵABCDEFGP *d e f g r vg Clem ter Orig septies Eus Bas Cyr Chr Hil Ambrst etc.* and the editors. I think this merits attention.

1 Cor. ii. 15 also seems interesting. For "ο δε πνευματικος ανακρινει μεν παντα (or τα παντα)" *Macarius* says και παντας μεν ανθρωπους ανακρινει κατα το γεγραμμενον. Now *boh* says ⲛⲉⲛⲭⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲃⲉⲛ, but *sah* here ⲛⲟⲩⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲙ which would almost correspond with παντας ανθρωπους.

1 Cor. ii. 13/15. Beginning in verse 13 πνευματικοις πνευματικα *Macar* runs to end of 15, merely eliding in 14/15 "και ου δυναται γνωναι οτι πνευματικος ανακρινεται." The only variation is in verse 14 εστι τουτω for αυτω εστι. Both copts use ⲛⲁϥ.

1 Cor. vi. 17. *Macar* repeats here the form: ο κολλωμενος τω Κυριω εσται εἰς ἓν πνευμα for ο δε κολλ. τω Κυριω ἓν πνευμα εστι.

*Boh* is ⲟⲩⲡⲛⲁ ⲛⲟⲩⲱⲧ (ⲡⲉ), not agreeing (*sah* not extant).

2 Cor. xiii. 13. The form of salutation is thus given: η χαρις του Κυριου ημων Ιησου Χριστου και η αγαπη του Θεου και πατρος και η κοινωνια του αγιου πνευματος.

The Greek uncials do not add ημων, but both *coptics* do (with some Gk cursives *vg syr*$^{sch}$ *arm aeth goth Bas Did Chr Thdrt Ambrst*).

The addition of του πατρος, however, is not coptic. Probably a recollection of Eph. vi. 23 (with which Epistle *Macarius* is so familiar).

We pass now to *De libertate mentis*:

The first quotation is from 2 Cor. vii. 1 introduced by και τουτο εστι το καθαιρειν (for καθαρισωμεν), otherwise no change.

Follows 1 Cor. iii. 17 (a reference, very free) and 2 Cor. xi. 2 (exact) and 1 Cor. ix. 22 (inexact, employing κερδησω for σωσω from context; in the last *Macar* says ινα τους παντας κερδηση for ινα παντως τινας σωσω. The coptic is plainly ϩⲓⲙⲁ ⲡⲁⲛⲧⲱⲥ ⲛⲧⲁⲛⲟϩⲉⲓ ⲛϩⲁⲛⲟⲩⲟⲛ).

So *Palladius* (*Dial. de vita S. Joann. Chrysostomi*) mixes up 1 Cor. ix. 20 and 22, thus:

οτι εγενομην τοις πασι τα παντα τοις Ιουδαιοις ως Ιουδαιος ινα Ιουδαιους κερδησω, τοις ασθενεσιν ως ασθενης ινα ασθενεις κερδησω τοις ανομοις ως ανομος ινα ανομους κερδησω.

He thus also applies κερδησω to τοις πασι τα παντα as it were.

2 Cor. xi. 14 (verbally exact but out of order).

2 Cor. x. 5 (exact, but printed text = καταιρουντες).

2 Cor. xiii. 3, Gal. ii. 20, iii. 27 (all pretty exact).

Then follows another reference to John xiv. 23 in slightly different words from the last:

ελευσομεθα εγω τε και ο πατηρ μου και μονην παρ αυτω ποιησομεν.

Rom. viii. 3 (exact, as far as it goes).

1 Cor. vi. 17 again in the same form.

John xvii. 21. "ωσπερ εγω και συ ἐν εσμεν ινα και ουτοι εν ημιν ἓν ωσιν."

Ordinary text has καθως *etc.* (*copt* ⲕⲁⲧⲁ ⲫⲣⲏ†); οὗτοι for αὐτοι seems to favour coptic.

Rom. vii. 19/20. "ου γαρ ο θελω τουτο ποιω" is composite from 19: ου γαρ ο θελω ποιω αγαθον . . .
and 20: ει δε ο ου θελω (εγω) τουτο ποιω.

Rom. viii. 35. Exact as far as quoted.

1 Cor. x. 13. The third time this is quoted. Previously υμας πειρασθηναι twice now becomes ημας πειρ. (probably a misprint) and υμας is again elided before υπενεγκειν with most Greeks.

Heb. xii 8. Exact.

Rom. viii. 18. Exact.

Matt. xi. 12. Exact, but for the order (which in the context is legitimate) βιαζεται (γαρ φησιν ο αψευδης Κυριος) η βασιλεια των ουρανων και βιασται αρπαζουσιν αυτην.

Eph. iv. 31. *Macar* again elides και θυμος from his quotation, and here the printed text says αφ ημων (although the Latin opposite, often incorrect however, has *a vobis*) and previously αφ υμων is printed (in *de custodia cordis* and *Hom.* xix.).

Rom. viii. 28. Again the quotation is το αγαθον. See *ante* on this.

Now comes the longest consecutive quotation (except perhaps *supra* Heb. iii. 16–iv. 3), and it is very useful, for parts of it have appeared before and the variations in those parts are con-

firmed here. So that, even if *Macarius* were not copying from his exemplar in those passages, we know that he reproduced it rather faithfully, for he must have been copying here. Yet for the third or fourth time we have the εις την αυτην εικονα in verse 18 with *bohairic* alone (*sah* not extant) and in general agreement there with *boh* construction. I copy passage and context:

2 Cor. iii. 7/11, 12, 18:

"(7) ει δε η διακονια του θανατου εν γραμμασιν εντετυπωμενη εν λιθοις εγενηθη εν δοξη ωστε μη δυνασθαι τους υιους Ισραηλ ατενισαι (*pro* ατενισαι τους υιους Ισραηλ, *cf. boh*: ⲛⲉⲛⲯⲏⲣⲓ ⲙ̅ⲡⲓⲥⲗ̅ ⲯⲭⲉⲙⲙⲟⲩ ⲛ̅ⲭⲟⲩⲱⲧ) εις προσωπον (— το, *cf. boh*: ⲉⲫⲟⲩⲛ ⲫⲉⲛ ⲡⲍⲟ, only three MSS. ⲡⲓⲍⲟ) Μωσεως δια την δοξαν του προσωπου αυτου την καταργουμενην. (8) ποσω μαλλον (*pro* πως ουχι μαλλον, *cf. boh verbatim* ⲡⲱⲥⲱ ⲙⲁⲗⲗⲟⲛ) η διακονια του πνευματος εσται εν δοξη; (9) ει γαρ η διακονια [*cum boh* ⲧⲇⲓⲁⲕⲟⲛⲓⲁ, *contra* τη διακονια ℵACD*FG *d e am fu*** *syr aeth Orig Cyr Ambrst Lachm. Tisch. Treg. W-H mg. Rev. mg.*] της κατακρισεως δοξα· πολλω μαλλον περισσευσει (*pro* περισσευει, *cum boh* ⲥⲛⲁⲉⲣⲍⲟⲩⲟ, *ut gr* DE 38 72 93 221 260 *d e g syr Orig*[int] *Ambrst*) η διακονια της δικαιοσυνης εν δοξη (*cum boh* ⲫⲉⲛ ⲟⲩⲱⲟⲩ, *contra* δοξη — εν ℵ*ABC 17 39 67** 80 *Cyr Euthal*). (10) και γαρ ου (*pro* ουδε *cum boh et gr plur.*) δεδοξασται το δεδοξασμενον εν τουτω μερει (*absque* τω, *cf.* "in this respect" *boh* = ⲫⲉⲛ ⲡⲁⲓⲙⲉⲣⲟⲥ *contra gr omn.* εν τουτω τω μερει) ενεκεν της υπερβαλλουσης δοξης· (11) ει γαρ το καταργουμενον δια δοξης πολλω μαλλον το μενον εν δοξη; [[καταργουμενον ειρηκε δια το θνητω σωματι Μωυσεως περικεισθαι την του φωτος δοξαν. επαγει·]] (12) εχοντες ουν ελπιδα (— τοιαυτην; *cf. ord. copt* ⲛ̅ⲟⲩⲍⲉⲗⲡⲓⲥ ⲙ̅ⲡⲁⲓⲣⲏ†) πολλη παρρησια χρωμεθα. [[και προβας μικρον εδειξε την αθανατον εκεινην του πνευματος εν αποκαλυψει δοξαν νυν εν τω αθανατω του εσω ανθρωπω τοις αξιοις αθανατως τε και ακαταργητως ελλαμπεσθαι, φησι γουν·]] (13) ημεις δε παντες [[τουτ'εστιν οι κατα τελειαν πιστιν εκ του πνευματος γενηθεντες]] ανακεκαλυμμενω προσωπω την δοξαν Κυριου ενοπτριζομεθα εις την αυτην εικονα μεταμορφουμενοι (*pro* κατοπτριζομενοι την αυτην εικονα μεταμορφουμεθα; *cf. boh*: ⲫⲉⲛ ⲟⲩⲍⲟ ⲉⲫⲥⲱⲣⲡ

ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲧⲉⲛⲭⲟⲩⲱⲧ ⲉⲡⲱⲟⲩ ⲙ̄ⲡ̄ⲥ̄ ϩⲉⲛ ⲟⲩⲓⲁϩ· ⲉⲛⲱⲓⲃϯ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲛ ⲛ̄ϩⲣⲏⲓ ϩⲉⲛ [*ut supra jam bis Macar*] ⲧⲁⲓϩⲓⲕⲱⲛ ⲧⲁⲓϩⲓⲕⲱⲛ) απο δοξης εις δοξην [*sic apud Galland.*] καθαπερ απο Κυριου πνευματος."

I submit that this is a pretty and a decisive passage. I have not reserved it to the last. It comes in naturally here in our investigation just before the close of this last tract of *Macarius*. Now, in the light of this, what are we to think of that which the writer says in the article on Texts and Versions "nor can it be proved from the documents we possess" that *bohairic* was a literary language before 518 A.D.? We have already seen that Dom Butler puts the *bohairic version* of the *Lausiac History* before 450 A.D., and this exhibition of *Macarius* takes us back to *circa* 370 A.D., while, as I show for Greek ℵ, by itself or by its parent, we get back to 300 A.D. or thereabouts in any case.

I forbear to give more space to an analysis of the readings here. Anyone who will take the trouble to pass carefully over the section above will find marvellous agreement with *boh* throughout, even to *Macarius'* sudden change to ενοπτριζομεθα here, for twice previously it had been κατοπτριζομεθα in his quotations of this last verse.

*Balestri* has not been able to give us anything *sahidic* in 2 Corinthians before x. 7. At this writing I do not know whether Mr. Horner has been able to find other *sahidic* material. But I am not afraid that the agreement of *Macarius* should be as much with *sah* or more so than with *boh*. The *boh* agreement is so deep it looks very basic to me.

[P.S.—Mr. Horner tells me that we still lack nearly all the first eight chapters of 2 Cor. He will print a few fragments here, but so far they are nothing more.]

2 Cor. iv. 6 following, is rather free.

Heb. v. 14. *Macar* brings διακρισιν last in the verse: "προς την του καλου και κακου διακρισιν," which appears to be opposed to coptic as well as Greek and Latin order.

2 Pet. i. 19 is regular except for the introduction: και υμεις εχοντες τον προφητικον λογον instead of "και εχομεν βεβαιοτερον τον προφητικον λογον."

*Boh* expresses it: "and is firm for us the word of the prophets."

Rom. xii. 6. *Macar* inserts του Θεου after χαριν, reading κατα την χαριν του Θεου την δοθεισαν. *Boh* (but not all MSS.) has a variation here, reading ⲡⲱⲓ ⲙⲡⲓⲍⲙⲟⲧ "according to (*the*) *measure of* the grace." This ⲡⲱⲓ ⲙ may have been confused.

*Boh* continues "whether prophecy according to the likeness of faith." It may be recalled that Jerome and Eucherius say "secundum *mensuram* fidei" here instead of "secundum *rationem* fidei" for κατα την αναλογιαν της πιστεως.

( + του Θεου might also have been engendered from misreading *sah* ⲛⲧⲁⲩⲧⲁⲁⲥ.)

Matt. xvi. 26 might appear too loose for any comparison, but we will give it because it is noticeable that *Macarius* introduces the verse not with ωφελειται or ωφεληθησεται, but with κερδος. Now in *boh* the *same* word is used twice over for "gain." *Boh* does not say "For what shall it *profit* a man if he *gain* the whole world?" but "For what will the man gain (ⲟⲩ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲉⲧⲉ ⲡⲓⲣⲱⲙⲓ ⲛⲁⲭⲉⲙⲍⲏⲟⲩ ⲙⲙⲟⲥ) if he should gain (ⲁⲫⲱⲁⲛ-ⲭⲉⲙⲍⲏⲟⲩ) the world whole?"

Now *Macarius* (instead of "τι γαρ ωφελειται ανθρωπος εαν τον κοσμον ολον κερδηση") says:

τι γαρ κερδος (φησι) τω ανθρωπω, ει τον κοσμον ολον κερδησας . . .

Notice τι γαρ κερδος τω ανθρωπω *Macarius*

ⲟⲩ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲉⲧⲉ ⲡⲓⲣⲱⲙⲓ ⲛⲁⲭⲉⲙⲍⲏⲟⲩ ⲙⲙⲟⲥ *boh.*

This κερδος τω ανθρωπω looks very much like the turn of the coptic phrase ⲉⲧⲉ ⲡⲓⲣⲱⲙⲓ ⲛⲁⲭⲉⲙⲍⲏⲟⲩ ⲙⲙⲟⲥ. No Greeks give an article to ανθρωπος.

Note that *Clem*$^{2\ Cor.}$ says τι γαρ το οφελος εαν . . .

Matt. vii. 7 is loose, eliding ζητειτε και ευρησετε. *Macar* writes: αιτειτε (γαρ φησι) και δοθησεται υμιν· κρουετε, ανοιγησεται, thus doing away with και between κρουετε and ανοιγησεται. This is coptic fashion. *Boh* does not do it here, but *sah* does: "Ask that it may be given to you; seek that ye may find; knock that it may be opened to you."

Surely we see the coptic *mind* of Macarius *thinking* here "*more copt.*"

This ends the quotations from *Macarius the Great.*

In the *Apophthegmata* occurs 1 Tim. vi. 7 without variation.

In *S. Macar. Alex. Abb. Nitr. Regula ad Monachos* occurs:

James iv. 6 } where, although the order of the two clauses is
1 Pet. v. 5 } reversed (without authority except by *Ambrosiaster*; *al.*?), the quotation is introduced by *Quia* (absent in Greek and Latin in St. James) = *copt* ⲭⲉ where it duly appears in *bohairic* (*sah* not extant in St. James).

(The quotation is repeated in similar order with the prefix *quia* in "*Alia patrum regula ad monachos*" (Galland. vii. 247).

## Mark the Monk.

Turning now to *Mark the monk and hermit*, whose writings are full of Scripture, and who is said in the Lausiac History to have known The Scriptures by heart, we find, besides the passages already adduced which agree with Macarius, others of some value. *Mark* indeed can mix scripture also, as: ει τις ουκ αποτασσεται πασι τοις υπαρχουσιν αυτω ουκ εστι μου αξιος, where he combines Luke xiv. 33 and Matt. x. 38.

But notice Matt. xxv. 21 (23): ευ δουλε αγαθε και πιστε επι ολιγα εγενου (*pro* ης) πιστος επι πολλων σε καταστησω εισελθε εις την χαραν του Κυριου.

*Boh* says ⲁⲕⲛ̄ⲥⲟⲧ, but *sah* ⲁⲕⲱⲱⲡⲉ ⲉⲕⲛ̄ⲥⲟⲧ and so M$^{boh}$. I have before referred to M$^{copt}$ (Morgan Gospels and elsewhere) and spoken of *boh* and *sah* having been once closer than they are now. Here *boh* and *sah* draw together through M$^{boh}$ and *Mark the monk* with εγενου.† Note that *Mark* omits σου at end of the quotation. So only, I think, Latin *Moling* (*ver.* 23).

Matt. xxiv. 20. φυγη εν χειμωνι η εν σαββατω. So *boh* definitely (rather than *sah*) ϩⲉⲛ ⲧϥⲣⲱ for χειμωνος of *all* Greeks.

Matt. xiii. 33 in full (*Opusc.* 3) is regular except εκρυψεν εις for ενεκρυψεν εις (as in Luke).

John xv. 22 is regular.

Matt. xviii. 32/35 is longer. In verse 33 *Mark* supplies αφιεναι αυτω το οφειλομενον before ως και εγω.

In 34 he gets free, for και οργισθεις ο κυριος αυτου παρεδωκεν, saying: και οργισθεις (φησι) παραδοτε; then continues.

† M$^{boh}$ came from the monastery of SS. Antony and Paul in the desert East of the Nile.

At 34 *fin.* — αυτω with many.

35 runs : ουτως ποιησει υμιν ο πατηρ μου ο εν τοις ουρανοις order with *sah* against *boh* (*pro* ουτω και ο πατηρ μου ο επουρανιος) εαν μη αφητε εκαστος τω αδελφω αυτου τα παραπτωματα απο των καρδιων υμων [*pro* εαν μη αφ. εκ. τω. αδ. αυτου απο των καρδιων υμων (τα παραπτωματα αυτων)]. The latter differs from *copt*, both coptics eliding τα παραπτωματα αυτων with Greek ℵBDL and all *it.* except *f h.*

Luke xiii. 2/5 (1) is also longer. He begins by mixing verses 1 and 2 δοκειτε γαρ φησιν οτι ὡν το αιμα εμιξε Πιλατος μετα των Γαλιλαιων and continues : αμωτωλοτεροι† (*pro* αμαρτωλοι) ησαν παρα παντας ανθρωπους τους επι γην‡ (— οτι τοιαυτα πεπονθασιν *cum gr* 71 *c*). (3) ου (*pro* ουχι) λεγω υμιν αλλα εαν μη μετανοησητε (*pro* μετανοητε, *cum* ADMXΓ) ωσαυτως (— παντες *cum ff*$_2$ *l*) απολεισθε. (4) και οι δεκα και οκτω§ (*pro* η εκεινοι οι δεκα και οκτω) εφ ους επεσεν ο πυργος του (*pro* εν τω *cum* D$^{gr}$ [*non d*]) Σιλωαμ και απεκτεινεν αυτους δοκειτε οτι (— ουτοι *cum* D 240 241 *d e et syr*) αμαρτωλοτεροι ησαν (*pro* οφειλεται εγενοντο)‖ παρα παντας ανθρωπους τους κατοικουντας Ιερουσαλημ (— εν *cum gr* BDLX *e* [*non copt*]). (5) ου (*pro* ουχι) λεγω υμιν αλλ' εαν μη μετανοησητε (*pro* μετανοητε) ωσαυτως (*pro* ομοιως, — παντες *cum ff*$_2$ *i l syr cu boh* MSS. *duobus*) απολεισθε.

A careful study of the above will show the Egyptian mind at αμαρτωλοτεροι (*bis*) and several other cognate things.

How insistently the base of the Latins *c d e ff*$_2$ and *l* intrude into this text of 390 A.D.! And they do not agree among themselves. Yet *Mark the monk* seems to harmonize them here *behind* the coptic.

Mark viii. 35 thus : ο απολεσας την ψυχην αυτου ενεκεν εμου και (Luke xiv. 26) του ευαγγελιου εις ζωην αιωνιον φυλαξει αυτην [και παλιν αρνησασθαι παντα βουλευων προστιθησιν] ετι δε και την εαυτου ψυχην.

---

† Compare *boh* ⲛ̄ⲣⲉϥⲉⲣⲛⲟⲃⲓ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲟⲩⲧⲉ ; *sah* ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲩⲣ̄ⲛⲟⲃⲉ ⲡⲁⲣⲁ.

‡ New apparently.

§ One *sah* MS. says *Then* for *Or* (*init.*) and *boh* omits εκεινοι.

‖ *Cf. boh.*

Quotations from St. Mark are rare enough, but here *Mark the hermit* disappoints us and is too free for comparison, while adding (without authority) εις ζωην αιωνιον to φυλαξαι (*pro* σωσαι). *Sah* has ⲫⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩⲱⲕ (against *boh's* ⲉⲫⲉⲛⲁϩⲙⲉⲥ) and might have engendered this φυλαξαι, "*conservare.*"

John v. 44 he quotes thus (so AL 1 22 33 249 473 *Cyr*): πως γαρ δυνασθε (φησι) πιστευειν δοξαν παρα ανθρωπων (*pro* αλληλων) λαμβανοντες και την δοξαν την παρα του μονου Θεου ου ζητουντες (*pro* ζητειτε).

This ανθρωπων is not *coptic* but was used by *Orig* 1/2 *Eus Hil Ephr* and $\Delta^{gr}$ and some cursives.

ζητουντες agrees with ℵ* greek some cursives *e l Ephr Bas Chr Aug* and *Macar.*

John iv. 34 is as loose, for he says εμον βρωμα εστιν ινα ποιω το θελημα του πατρος μου (for του πεμψαντος με), substituting for "και τελειωσω αυτου το εργον": παντας ανθρωπους σωθηναι και εις επιγνωσιν αληθειας ελθειν κατα τον λογον Παυλου (1 Tim. ii. 4).

But "of my Father" is Egyptian, for one *sah* MS. (114) reads "of the Father he who sent me" and (*aeth*).

John vii. 38, 39 follows however word for word with the usual text, except for the use of ελεγεν for ειπε in verse 39. This ελεγεν however belongs to ℵ *Did Cyr* and *c ff*$_2$ *l q* (ⲉⲧⲁⲥⲭⲟⲥ *boh*).

Matt. xiii. 44 thus: ομοια γαρ εστιν η βασιλεια των ουρανων θησαυρω κεκρυμμενω εν αγρω (— τω) ον ευρων ανθρωπος εκρυψε· (then freely: και απελθων επωλησε παντα και ηγορασε [*pro* αγοραζει] τον αγρον εκεινον).

εν αγρω, "in *a* field," = distinctly *boh* (ϩⲉⲛ ⲟⲩⲓⲟϩⲓ) with $D^{gr}$ [*prob.* from *d* "agro" but *against sah* (ϩⲛ̄ ⲧⲥⲱⲙⲉ)].

The elision of και απο της χαρας αυτου υπαγει is evidently intentional, but the continuation involving ηγορασε for αγοραζει = *boh* alone (against *sah* and the Greeks) with most Latins.

[*Sah* here = *Hilary* "Ideo absconsus est thesaurus quia et agrum emi oportebat." *Sah* "and out of his joy he is wont to go and sell all things which he hath and buy that field."]

John xv. 5, 16; i. 3, xiv. 6 all agree with the ordinary text.

Luke vi. 46. τι με καλειτε Κυριε Κυριε και ου ποιειτε α λεγω is regular.

But Matt. vii. 12 οσα θελετε ινα ποιωσιν υμιν οι ανθρωποι, και (Luke vi. 31) υμεις ποιειτε αυτοις ομοιως (*pro* ουτω και υμεις ποιειτε αυτοις) is exactly the manner of both *boh* and *sah* (against Greek) not only bringing ουτως *last*, but making it ομοιως = ϯⲙⲡⲁⲓⲣⲏ† *boh*, ⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲓϩⲉ *sah*. Most Latins who have ουτω (for some omit with $L^{gr}$, as *c ff*$_1$ *l vg* with *syr cu*) write "*ita* et vos facite illis"; Jerome alone preserves the order of *copt Marc mon* by saying (*ep. ad Gal.*) "et vos eis facite *similiter*," but this is from Luke (vi. 31) doubtless, whence *boh sah* and *Marc mon* no doubt also got their ομοιως.

Matt. xvi. 28. και εισι τινες των ωδε εστηκοτων οιτινες ου μη γευσωνται θανατου, εως αν ιδωσι την βασιλειαν του Θεου εληλυθυιαν εν δυναμει (*pro* εως αν ιδ. τον υιον του ανθρωπου ερχομενον εν τη βασιλεια αυτου).

This is distinctly an innovation. No support from *coptic*. The copts have τον υιον του ανθρωπου and only *boh* varies δοξη for βασιλεια with ℵ$^c$ and a few.

John xiv. 2. Instead of εν τη οικια του πατρος μου μοναι πολλαι εισιν *Marc mon* writes

μοναι πολλαι παρα τω πατρι.

Short as it is it brings "many mansions" to the front, as do both *coptics*, beginning the verse thus, with εν οικια του πατρος μου later.

The Greeks do not do this, but *Iren bis Tert ter* with *e*, *coptic*, and *syriac* do it.

And the παρα τω πατρι reminds one of *Tertullian* "Licet multae mansiones *penes* patrem eundem" (*Monog.*).

"Dominus multas mansiones quasi domus apud patrem repromittit" (*Resurr.*).

"Quomodo multae mansiones apud patrem" (*Scorp.*).

We should never think of saying in English "Many mansions are in the house of my Father," because we are accustomed to "In the house of my Father are many mansions." But *Marc mon* was accustomed to the reverse.

Matt. vi. 25 } (25) μη μεριμνησητε (*pro* μεριμνατε) τι φαγητε
vi. 33 } (— τη ψυχη υμων) η (*pro* και, *cum* $B^{gr}$ *et latt*) τι πιητε, η (*pro* μηδε τω σωματι υμων) τι ενδυσησθε, (33) (αλλα μονον) ζητειτε (— δε πρωτον) την βασιλειαν του Θεου και την δικαιοσυνην αυτου και ταυτα παντα προστεθησεται υμιν.

This is very free. The coptics do not elide the "*soul*" or the "*body*" clauses. "Or what ye shall drink" for "*and* what . . ." is agreed to by *boh* and B$^{gr}$ *Latt*, but *sah* (some MSS.) omits the clause; those *sah* MSS. which have it say also "*Or* what ye shall drink."

In verse 33 πρωτον is omitted by *gr* 61 *b Justin Opt Chr*, not by the coptics, but no Greeks substitute μονον. *Gr* 27 only says προτερον.

(Luke xvi. 10.) ο εν ολιγω απιστος και εν πολλω απιστος εστιν.

Here the Greek calls for αδικος in both places. *Sah* is also quite clear, transliterating the Greek to ⲡⲁⲗⲓⲕⲟⲥ and ⲟⲩⲁⲗⲓⲕⲟⲥ, but *boh* goes out of its way to substitute ϭⲓ ⲛ̅ⲭⲟⲛⲥ "take by violence" in both places.

The *eye* can be misled from πιστος above in coptic, for they write ⲟⲩⲛ̅ⲓⲥⲧⲟⲥ: "The faithful in little is '*a* faithful (one)' also in great (things)." This seems the only clue.

Matt. xi. 29 }
Jo. xv. 13 } occur in full without variation.

Luke i. 35. *Marc mon* adds εκ σου *post* γεννωμενον with Greek C* 1 22 33 and some cursives 130$^{lat}$ *a c e m vg gat* (*syr*) *sax aeth etc.* (see *Tisch.*). Only partly implied in *boh* and *sah*.

This is followed by:

Matt. i. 20, where the only difference is at the end, *Mark the monk* reading εκ πνευματος αγιου εστιν (for εκ πνευματος εστιν αγιου) with greek D L *Evst* 259 *Orig*, but this is distinctly implied in *boh*: ϩⲉⲛ ⲟⲩⲛ̅ⲛ̅ⲁ̅ ⲉⲫⲟⲩⲁⲃ̅ ⲡⲉ, and in *sah*: ϩⲛ̅ ⲟⲩⲛ̅ⲛ̅ⲁ̅ ⲉⲫⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ̅ ⲡⲉ, and is supported by *it vg* and *Iren*$^{int}$.

This reading is a clear survival I should think, and is interesting. We cannot however differentiate between *sah* and *boh* as both agree. It is quite interesting to see how in the Gospels *Mark the monk's* quotations agree with *both* coptics and rarely go alone with *one*.

(Matt. xxvi. 26.) λαβετε φαγετε εξ αυτου παντες is free. Seems to be a recollection of S. Paul's:

1 Cor. x. 17: οτι εἷς αρτος ἓν σωμα οι πολλοι εσμεν· οι γαρ παντες εκ του ἑνος αρτου μετεχομεν.

This ends the Gospel quotations.

The Gospels then yield nothing very specific for *boh* against

*sah* except Matt. vi. 25, xiii. 44, xxiv. 20, although double agreement of *boh sah* is seen elsewhere. Nor are the longer quotations of great help.

But let us now examine the long passages outside the Gospels. And first:

Acts xix. 2/6:

(2) "ει πνευμα αγιον ελαβετε πιστευσαντες οι δε προς αυτον ειπον (*pro* ειπον προς αυτον *cum gr* 180) αλλ ουδε ει πνευμα αγιον εστιν ηκουσαμεν. (3) ειπεν ουν (*pro* τε *vel* δε, *cum gr* 511) προς αυτους εις τι ουν εβαπτισθητε; οι δε ειπον εις το Ιωαννου βαπτισμα. (4) ειπε δε Παυλος Ιωαννης μεν εβαπτισε μετανοιας λεγων τω λαω (*pro* τω λαω λεγων *contra boh et al.*) εις τον ερχομενον μετ αυτου (*vid.*) ινα πιστευσωσι τουτ'εστιν εις τον Ιησουν (— Χριστον, *cum boh vg* ℵABE *et al.*). (5) ακουσαντες δε εβαπτισθησαν εις το ονομα του Κυριου Ιησου. (6) και επιθεντος αυτοις του Παυλου τας χειρας ηλθε το πνευμα το αγιον επ' αυτους."

*Sah* Balestri is missing and there is nothing particular to connect this with *boh*, the exceptional order in verse 4, λεγων τω λαω, being apparently unsupported and against Greek, Latin and Bohairic. [Mr. Horner has shown me, however, that λεγων τω λαω is the order of *sah* as also ειπον προς αυτον in verse 2.]

Next (*Galland.* [62] *opusc.* v.):

Phil. ii. 5/10. "τουτο (— γαρ) φρονεισθω εν υμιν ο και εν Χριστω Ιησου. (6) ος εν μορφη Θεου υπαρχων ουχ αρπαγμον ηγησατο το ειναι ισα Θεω. (7) αλλ εαυτον εκενωσε μορφην δουλου λαβων εν ομοιωματι ανθρωπων γενομενος. (8) και σχηματι ευρεθεις ως ανθρωπος· εταπεινωσεν εαυτον γενομενος υπηκοος μεχρι θανατου, θανατου δε σταυρου. (9) διο και ο Θεος αυτον υπερυψωσε και εχαρισατο αυτω ονομα το υπερ παν ονομα. (10) ινα εν τω ονοματι Ιησου Χριστου (+ Χριστου *cum* ℵ* *gr, non copt*) παν γονυ καμψη επουρανιων και επιγειων και καταχθονιων."

In this grand passage, practically unchanged, we see nothing but clear Greek.

The omission of γαρ in verse 5 it is true = *copt* and *sah*, but also ℵ*ABC 17 37 73 *arm aeth* (*Orig*); but the addition of Χριστου in verse 10 is against both coptics and only has the support of ℵ* 47 73 114 115 118 *aeth Orig* 1/4 *Chr* 1/2 *Cyr Vigil Taps.* ℵ* and *Marc mon* seem to conspire here.

*Mark* repeats Phil. ii. 5/8 in *opusc.* vii (*Galland.*[73]) without variation except for φρονεισθε verse 5. He again omits γαρ.

Again:

Acts vi. 2/5. ουκ αρεστον εστι καταλιποντας ημας (*pro* ημας καταλειψαντας) τον λογον του Θεου διακονειν τραπεζαις. [3] επισκεψασθε ουν (— αδελφοι) εξ υμων αυτων ανδρας (*pro* ανδρας εξ υμων) μαρτυρουμενους επτα (— πληρεις πνευματος αγιου και σοφιας) ους καταστησωμεν (*sic*) επι της χρειας ταυτης. [4] ημεις δε τη προσευχη και τη διακονια του λογου προσκαρτερησωμεν (*sic*). [5] και ηρεσεν ο λογος ενωπιον παντος του πληθους.

The differences are certainly not *boh* (*sah* not extant in Balestri, but I do not find them in Mr. Horner's text).

A[gr] omits αδελφοι and *aeth* with *Orig*[int].

There seems to be no authority for omitting πληρεις *etc.* except by *arm.*

Eph. iii. 14/17. [14] τουτο χαριν καμπτω τα γονατα μου προς τον πατερα του Κυριου ημων Ιησου Χριστου. [16] ινα δωη υμιν ο Κυριος δυναμιν κραταιωθηναι δια του πνευματος αυτου εις τον εσω ανθρωπον. [17] κατοικησαι τον Χριστον εν παση πληροφορια και αισθησει εις τας καρδιας ημων δια της πιστεως.

We elide verse 15 εξ ου πασα πατρια εν ουρανοις και επι γης ονομαζεται.

In verse 16 we cut out κατα τον πλουτον της δοξης αυτου, substituting ο Κυριος, and use δυναμιν for δυναμει.

Verse 17 we expand, inserting εν παση πληροφορια και αισθεσει and placing δια της πιστεως at the end instead of after Χριστον.

This εν παση πληροφορια και αισθεσει is not scriptural but is a recollection of Col. ii. 2 και εις παντα πλουτον της πληροφοριας της συνεσεως, or Heb. x. 22 μετα αληθηνης καρδιας εν πληροφορια πιστεως ερραντισμενοι τας καρδιας απο συνειδησεως πονηρας. Yet to find a parallel for αισθεσει we must turn to Phil. i. 9 ινα η αγαπη υμων ετι μαλλον και μαλλον περισσευη εν επιγνωσει και παση αισθησει.

In *Justin* or *Clement of Rome* or *Polycarp* this would be called a quotation from an unknown source outside of *Ephesians*, but *Marc mon* is merely free here. No support from the coptics.

1 Cor. i. 17, 27/29:

[17] ουκ απεστειλε με Χριστος βαπτιζειν αλλ' ευαγγελι-

ζεσθαι ουκ εν σοφια λογου ινα μη κενωθη ο σταυρος του Χριστου (και παλιν) [27] τα μωρα του κοσμου εξελεξατο ο Θεος ινα καταισχυνη τους σοφους. [28] και τα αγενη του κοσμου και τα εξουδενουμενα εξελεξατο ο Θεος και τα μη οντα ινα τα οντα καταργηση οπως μη καυχησηται πασα σαρξ ενωπιον του Θεου.

Verse 17 agrees exactly.

In verse 27 the order ινα καταισχυνη τους σοφους agrees with the Greek uncials and *copt*, against *textus receptus* ινα τους σοφους καταισχ. He then abandons the rest of the verse: και τα ασθενη του κοσμου εξελεξατο ο Θεος ινα καταισχυνη τα ισχυρα (*cf.* greek AFG and *sah*) and continues with verse 28. It seems pretty clear that even in these long quotations *Mark the monk* lived up to his reputation of knowing the Scriptures by heart and did not use the book.

In verse 28 for εξουθενημενα he uses εξουδενουμενα (*cf.* Greek 17 252 *Orig*); and closes verse 29 του Θεου for αυτου (against *text. recept.*) with most Greeks and *copt.*

Heb. vi. 1/2, 4/6. The quotation yields the rather significant variation προς μετανοιαν for εἰς μετανοιαν in verse 6 without Greek support, but *boh* is ⲉⲩⲙⲉⲧⲁⲛⲟⲓⲁ, ⲉⲩ = ⲉⲟⲩ, "*towards a*," ⲉ in coptic being the equivalent of προς as well as of εἰς (Mallon, § 46 and 313). (*Sah* not extant.)

This is followed immediately by:

Heb. x. 26, where the verse closes ουκετι απολειπεται θυσια περι αμαρτιας (for ουκετι περι αμαρτιων απολειπεται θυσια) with Greek $D^c$ only as to order, but distinctly with *boh* (*sah* wanting) bringing περι αμαρ. last, thus:

ⲙ̅ⲙⲟⲛ ⲱⲟⲩⲱⲟⲩⲱⲓ ⲭⲉ ⲥⲱⲭⲡ ⲉⲃⲏⲉ ⲫⲁⲛⲛⲟⲃⲓ.

Rom. vii. 24/25, viii. 2. In practical accord with the ordinary text, but it is noteworthy that viii. 2, quoted on *three* occasions, is given each time *minus* εν Χριστω Ιησου. This is not *boh* or *sah* as we know them, but omitted by $K^{gr}$ 76 *Chr* and *Tertullian.* Although Tischendorf records *Marc mon* fairly often he does not do so here. The agreement with $K^{gr}$ is interesting in connection with αμαρτηματων in 2 Pet. i. 9 by *Marc mon* 1/2 and the Greeks ℵAK. And the agreement with *Tertullian* (*Pudic.*) here is very curious, for *Mark* emphasizes this omission most decidedly three times over, but *Tertullian* only 1/2.

Rom. xi. 34/36. τις εγνω νουν Κυριου η τις συμβουλος αυτου εγενετο η τις προεδωκεν αυτω και ανταποδοθησεται αυτω οτι εξ αυτου και δι αυτου και εις αυτον παντα ( – τα) αυτω η δοξα εις τους αιωνας των αιωνων αμην.

Practically no variation. As to παντα *cf.* *boh* ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ. Greeks do not omit.

In the Epistles then there is a good deal of interest.

## Mark the Monk in Epistles, etc.

We forbear to go through these in full as it would take too long. We will point out some places which seem near to *copt*, or otherwise interesting.

(1 Tim. i. 7. περι τινος (for περι τινων) = $P^{gr}$ $syr^{sch}$. Not *boh*. All *boh*, but one, say ⲉⲛⲏ ⲉⲧⲟⲩⲁⲁⲩ (B[a] omits ⲉⲛⲏ). *Sah* (Balestri) = ⲛ̀ⲛⲉⲧⲟⲩⲁⲁⲩ.)

Heb. iv. 13. παντα γαρ γυμνα τετραχηλισμενα (– και). Thus *Mark*. γαρ for δε is read by the *boh* MSS. $H^{mg}$ J [no Greeks] but all have και before τετραχ. (One *sah* MS. has δε, the other omits δε.)

Gal. v. 17. σαρξ επιθυμει κατα του πνευματος και το πνευμα κατα της σαρκος.

και το (for το δε of all Greeks) is read by *boh* MSS. HJ (*sah* not extant in Balestri but confirmed for *sah* by Horner). Repeated in the same form (Galland.[75]) but regular (Galland.[86]).

[*Mark's* knowledge of Scripture is again shown by the combination of Rom. x. 17 and Heb. xi. 1 (*opusc.* ii.).]

2 Cor. xiii. 5 (*boh* and *sah* both extant). δοκιμαζετε εαυτους (for εαυτους δοκιμαζετε of all Greeks) is very definitely with *boh*: ⲁⲣⲓⲁⲟⲕⲓⲙⲁⲍⲓⲛ ⲙ̀ⲙⲁⲱⲧⲉⲛ ⲙ̀ⲙⲁⲩⲁⲧⲉⲛ ⲑⲏⲛⲟⲩ and *sah*: ⲁⲟⲕⲓⲙⲁⲍⲉ ⲙ̀ⲙⲁⲱⲧⲛ̀. (As regards order both *boh* and *sah* turn the phrase thus: "Try your own selves whether ye are in the faith; prove your own selves," while *Mark*, eliding the introductory εαυτους πειραζετε (*copt* πειραζετε εαυτους) merely says: "δοκιμαζετε εαυτους ει εστε εν τη πιστει.)

Continuing he writes: ει δε ουκ επιγνωσκετε οτι Χριστος Ιησους οικει εν υμιν (*pro* εν υμιν εστιν) ει μητι αρα (*abest* αρα *in Graecis plur.*) αδοκιμοι εστε.

Most Greeks elide εστιν, but *boh* is very definite with ϣⲟⲡ ϩⲉⲛ ⲑⲏⲛⲟⲩ = either εστι εν υμιν or οικει εν υμιν. (*Sah* ⲛ̄ϩⲏⲧⲧⲏⲩⲧⲛ̄.) *Marc mon* repeats this (Galland.[41]) exactly the same way. See also *Isai Abb* (*infra*).

αρα is found in a handful of cursives (seven) but not in our greek uncials, and while *sah* says ⲉⲓⲙⲏⲧⲓ ⲭⲉ ⲙⲉϥⲁⲕ (= αρα), *boh* = ⲉⲃⲏⲗ ⲁⲣⲏⲟⲩ ⲭⲉ conveying αρα perfectly and (against ⲭⲉ ⲙⲉϥⲁⲕ of *sah*) keeping αρα (ⲁⲣⲏⲟⲩ) behind ⲭⲉ. Clearly then nearest to *boh* is *Mark*.

Heb. iv. 12. For ζων γαρ ο λογος του Θεου και ενεργης (εναργης B$^{gr}$ *Hier*) *Marc mon* has ζων γαρ ο λογος του Θεου και ενεργος υπαρχει. *Cf. boh* ⲟⲩⲟϩ ϥⲉⲣϩⲱⲃ (*sah* ⲁⲩⲱ ϥⲉⲛⲉⲣⲅⲉⲓ).

[Rom. xii. 10 in Gallandius (p. 30) should be Phil. ii. 3.]

2 Cor. x. 5. *Mark* (Galland.[32]) substitutes της δοξης for της γνωσεως. No Greeks do this except the MS. 17 (17 however is often close to us). *Sah* is wanting, and *boh* says ⲡⲓⲉⲙⲓ = της γνωσεως. I do not see that any words for *glory* except perhaps ⲡⲓⲁⲙⲟⲩⲛ and ⲡⲓⲙⲓⲟⲕ have any resemblance to ⲡⲓⲉⲙⲓ. On the other hand another word for *knowledge*, ⲡⲓⲥⲟⲟⲩⲛ, is rather like ⲡⲓⲁⲙⲟⲩⲛ, *glory*, in sound. But I do not see the connection here.

Quoting again (Galland.[39 and 41]) της γνωσεως is used however on both occasions.

Rom. iii. 23/24. παντες ημαρτον (– γαρ) κ.τ.λ.

Some *boh* MSS. also omit γαρ.

It would have small significance except in such an important passage. The verse begins with γαρ "ου γαρ εστι διαστολη" and continues with all Greeks παντες γαρ ημαρτον "For all have sinned and come short of the glory of God." And *boh* and *Mark* conspire to omit the second γαρ (*sah* missing, but in a fragment which Mr. Horner will publish the ⲣ of ⲣⲁⲣ appears present).

Rom. vi. 7. υπο της αμαρτιας *Mark*. Ordinary text απο. *Boh* = ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲁ, while *sah* ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲙ̄. (This is repeated by *Mark* again [Galland.[46]] in the same way.)

[2 Pet. ii. 22. ως κυων επιστρεψας επι τον ιδιον εμετον. So 137 182 *Ephr Chr Thdrt Thpl Maxim*, all no doubt *libere* with *Marc mon* for εξεραμα of the rest. (The *boh* word is ⲉⲡⲉϥϣⲓϯ.)]

[Jas. ii. 12. ουτως ποιειτε και ουτως λαλειτε is against both *greek* and *boh* order. *Boh* reads ⲥⲁϫⲓ ⲙ̄ⲡⲁⲓⲣⲏⲧ ⲟⲩⲟⲩ ⲁⲣⲓⲟⲩⲓ ⲙ̄ⲡⲁⲓⲣⲏⲧ, but *sah* looks and sounds more similar: ⲯⲁϫⲉ ⲛⲧⲉⲓϩⲉ ⲛⲧⲉⲧⲛⲉⲓⲣⲉ ⲛⲧⲉⲓϩⲉ, and may have given rise to the confusion.]

[Note that in 2 Pet. i. 9 *Mark* (Galland.[37]) reads αμαρτηματων (for αμαρτιων) with ℵAK, while previously (Galland.[35]) he read αμαρτιων with the rest.] See Rom. viii. 2 where three times over *Marc mon* omits εν Χριστω Ιησου with K and *Tertullian* 1/2 only. (See K$^{gr}$ again James i. 17 with παρα.)

Gal. iv. 26. Omit παντων with *boh* (*sah* Balestri missing but *Tisch.* quotes for omission [and other Oxford fragments omit] and most Greeks).

1 Tim. ii. 4. "ειπερ ο μεν θελει παντας ανθρωπους σωθηναι (*pro* ος παντας ανθρωπους θελει σωθηναι) και εις επιγνωσιν αληθειας ελθειν," agrees (against Greek) with *boh* order exactly: ϥⲁⲓ ⲉⲑⲟⲩⲱϣ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉ ⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲙⲓⲃⲉⲛ ⲛⲟϩⲉⲙ, bringing θελει before "the men" and apart from σωθηναι.

So also *sah*: ⲡⲁⲓ ⲉⲧⲟⲩⲉϣ ⲧⲣⲉ ⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲙⲓⲙ ⲱⲛϩ̄.

1 Cor. vi. 11. νυν δε απελουσασθε νυν δε εδικαιωθητε νυν δε εκαθαρισθητε apparently free, omitting αλλα ηγιασθητε and doubling the "cleansing."

Note *boh* MS. M omits αλλα αγιασθητε, as Horner says ex homoioteleuton.

Neglecting the doubling of "cleansing" we may note that previously (Galland.[36]) *Mark* quoted αλλ απελουσασθε αλλ ηγιασθητε, omitting αλλ εδικαιωθητε, so it would seem merely free.

Acts ii. 38. *Mark* adds του Κυριου ημων after ονοματι with *Epiph etc.* and *sah* (*teste Tisch.*, wanting in *Balestri*), and has εν τω ονοματι with Greek BCD (most Greeks επι as ℵAEP *min*, against the editors *L. Tr. W-H. R.*) while *boh* is ⲉϥⲣⲁⲛ.

Eph. iv. 30 omit του Θεου *Mark*, but this may be free, yet *Tertullian* omits 1/2 with Greek 2 49 *aeth Ath* 1/2 *Epiph Chr*, [not *boh* nor *sah*].

Gal. v. 22/23. The order is exactly with *Greek* and *copt*, but *Mark* opens οι δε καρποι for ο δε καρπος without *Greek* or *boh* support.

Follow Eph. iv. 13, Heb. xii. 22, Phil. iii. 12, Rom. viii. 35,

38, 39, Rom. viii. 16, 1 Cor. xv. 3 without variation; also Gal. iv. 6, only substituting ημων for υμων with many Greeks. *Boh* is divided.

Rom. v. 8, 9. *Mark* writes ημων οντων for οντων ημων. *Cf. boh.*

Rom. vi. 4 is shortened "και συνεταφημεν (— ουν) αυτω δια του βαπτισματος (— εις τον θανατον) ινα ωσπερ ηγερθη Χριστος εκ νεκρων (— δια της δοξης του πατρος) ουτω και ημεις εν καινοτητι ζωης περιπατησωμεν.

Most *boh* have ⲟⲩⲛ, but one MS. ⲟⲛ, and one omits. All have εις τον θανατον, but one MS. omits with *Mark* δια της δοξης του πατρος.

[Balestri's *sah* only begins at Rom. vi. 5; Horner shows me this verse mutilated, but it has ⲥ̅ⲉ̅ = ουν.] It is seen, however, in this and in other places that the agreement of *boh* MSS. between themselves seems to post-date *Mark the monk.*

Notice again here that *Tertullian* (*bis*) and *Iren*$^{int}$ with *Pacian Gaud* and *Chrom* omit with us δια της δοξης του πατρος. Again Tischendorf omits *Mark's* testimony here.

Eph. ii. 8/9 is deliberately shortened.

Follows Eph. v. 8 regular, and rather fragmentary quotations from other places, running Eph. iv. 30, ii. 3, Gal. iii. 3, Rom. viii. 12 together.

The only variation is in Gal. iii. 3 διαρξαμενους for εναρξαμενοι.

Rom. xii. 2. *Mark* says ημων for υμων.

Greek ABD*FG with *boh Clem Orig Cypr* omit. The others have υμων.

Eph. vi. 12 in full is without variation.

1 Pet. v. 8. Galland. prints καταπιει for καταπιη. Very likely it should be καταπιειν with ℵKLP most cursives *copt Orig Cypr etc.*

Rom. v. 14 is quoted twice (Galland.$^{50 \text{ and } 54}$), the first time επι τω ομοιωματι, but the second time with *boh*: εν τω ομοιωματι.

James i. 17 (Galland.$^{54}$). *Mark* uses παρα του πατρος for απο του πατρος. *Cf. boh* ϩⲓⲧⲉⲛ and *sah* ϩⲓⲧⲙ̅. This is interesting. So note only K$^{gr}$ and a few cursives with *Cyr*$^{ioh \text{ et } amos}$. (K$^{gr}$ can be seen with us above at 2 Pet. i. 9 and Rom. viii. 2.)

παρα is used again (Galland.$^{78}$).

Eph. iv. 13. Eliding και επιγνωσεως του υιου του Θεου, *Mark* opens with εως αν instead of μεχρι. *Cf. boh* and *sah* ϣⲁⲛⲧⲉ. No Greeks vary.

2 Tim. iii. 5 is free: μορφωσιν ευσεβειας εχοντες την δε δυναμιν αυτης ενωπιον Θεου μη κεκτημενοι.

This ενωπιον Θεου μη κεκτημενοι taking the place of ηρνημενοι.

(*Boh* is ⲧⲉⲥⲭⲟⲩ ⲁⲉ ⲉⲩⲭⲱⲗ ⲙⲙⲟⲥ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ.)

1 Cor. iv. 5 is free, as is 2 Cor. v. 15 and Rom. xii. 1, but as to the latter note ὡς θυσιαν and compare *boh*, which might possibly have given rise to it from confusion of ⲉⲣⲁⲧ ⲟⲩ with part of the verb-form. From Greek ως is absent.

*Boh* is ⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲥⲱⲙⲁ ⲉⲣⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲱⲟⲩⲱⲟⲩⲱⲓ ⲉⲫⲟⲛϩ,

while *sah* ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲧⲛ̄ⲥⲱⲙⲁ ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲑⲩⲥⲓⲁ ⲉⲥⲟⲛⲍ.

2 Cor. viii. 9 again is very free, as 1 John iv. 18, 16, while Phil. iv. 8 seems to be intended to be accurate; here *Mark* omits οσα προσφιλη, continuing παντα λογιζομενος (for ταυτα λογιζεσθε) after και ει τις επαινος.

This παντα is most interesting. It conveys to me the impression that *Mark* was looking at his graeco-coptic Bible, for while Greek is οσα . . οσα . . οσα . . οσα . . οσα . . οσα throughout, both coptics begin very soon after the opening to emphasize "every." I will show them in full. As regards *Mark's* omission of οσα προσφιλη *boh* does not bear this out, but *sah* seems to transpose και προσφιλη and και ευφημα in a peculiar way. In view of *Mark's* great accuracy in other long Pauline lists there must be a reason for this. Here is *boh*:

ⲧⲟ ⲗⲟⲓⲡⲟⲛ ⲛⲁⲥⲛⲏⲟⲩ ⲛⲏ ⲉⲧⲉ ⲫⲁⲛⲑⲙⲏⲓ ⲛⲉ. ⲛⲏ ⲉⲧⲉ ⲫⲁⲛⲙⲉⲧⲥⲉⲙⲛⲟⲥ ⲛⲉ. ⲛⲏ ⲉⲧⲉ ⲫⲁⲛⲇⲓⲕⲉⲟⲛ ⲛⲉ. ⲛⲏ ⲉⲧⲉ ⲫⲁⲛⲙⲉⲧⲧⲟⲩⲃⲟ ⲛⲉ. ⲫⲱⲃ ⲛⲓⲃⲉⲛ ϩⲉⲛ ⲟⲩⲙⲉⲓ. ⲫⲱⲃ ⲛⲓⲃⲉⲛ ⲛ̄ⲩⲉⲛⲛⲟⲩⲫⲓ· ϥⲏ ⲉⲧⲉ ⲟⲩⲁⲣⲉⲧⲏ ⲡⲉ. ⲟⲩⲟϩ ϥⲏ ⲉⲧⲉ ⲟⲩⲧⲁⲓⲟ ⲡⲉ. ⲛⲁⲓ ⲙⲉⲩⲓ ⲉⲣⲱⲟⲩ.

While *sah*:

ⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩ ⲇⲉ ⲛⲉⲥⲛⲏⲩ
ⲫⲱⲃ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲙⲙⲉ· ⲫⲱⲃ
ⲛⲓⲙ ⲛ̄ⲥⲉⲙⲛⲟⲛ·
ⲫⲱⲃ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲛ̄ⲇⲓⲕⲁⲓⲟⲛ·
ⲫⲱⲃ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲉⲧⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ·
ⲫⲱⲃ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲉⲧⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩⲫ·
ⲥⲙⲟⲩ ⲛⲓⲙ· ⲁⲣⲉⲧⲏ
ⲛⲓⲙ· ⲧⲁⲉⲓⲟ̄ ⲛⲓⲙ· ⲛⲁⲓ
ⲙⲉⲉⲩⲉ ⲉⲣⲟⲟⲩ

Note how *sah* makes the last part tripartite beginning with ⲥⲗⲗⲟⲩ ⲛⲓⲗⲗ.

[Rom. i. 25. For "*και εσεβασθησαν και ελατρευσαν τη κτισει παρα τον κτισαντα*" *Mark* has: "*τη κτισει λατρευοντες παρα τον κτισαντα*" freely as *Iren* twice "*creaturae potius* (1/2, *magis* 1/2) *quam creatori servientes.*"]

2 Cor. v. 20 though short: *Πρεσβευων υπερ Χριστου* (*pro Υπερ Χριστου ουν πρεσβευομεν*) has a ring of *boh* where *πρεσβ.* begins the verse:

ⲁⲛⲉⲣⲡⲣⲉⲥⲃⲉⲩⲓⲛ ⲟⲩⲛ ⲉⲭⲉⲛ ⲡ$\overline{\text{ⲭ}}$ⲥ.

1 Cor. xiii. 5/7. Passing quickly from verse 5 to verse 7 "*καθοτι ου λογιζεται το κακον*" *Mark* continues:

"*αλλα παντα στεργει, παντα ελπιζει, παντα πιστευει, παντα υπομενει, (κατα την γραφην).*"

This is decidedly interesting. In the Latin translation opposite: "*sed omnia* SUFFERT" is given, but this translation repeatedly wanders away to the common latin text from the real greek text of *Mark* (which is evidently printed faithfully because quotations repeated *more Marc.* apart from the ordinary text are given in the same form). Now *Cyprian* (and *Zeno*) witness to this *στεργει* (for *στεγει*) by giving *diligit*, and Tischendorf calls our attention to this in his notes, printing thus: "Cyp$^{199, 252, 304}$ Zeno$^{2, 6}$ (Gall.$^{5, 112}$) *diligit* (*στέργει*?). Utrumque ut$^{vid}$ conjung. aeth." He had evidently overlooked *στεργει* in the text of *Marc mon.* How is it *Cypr* witnesses to *στεργει* if Latin Africa was so far removed from coptic, or *bohairic* Egypt? *Marc mon* does not quote this passage again, but *στεργει* would seem certain here.

The *boh* is however: ϣⲁⲥⲱⲟⲩ $\overline{\text{ⲛ}}$ⲍⲏⲧ ϩⲉⲛ ⲍⲱⲃ ⲛⲓⲃⲉⲛ; and *sah*: ϣⲁⲥ ⲫⲓ ⲍⲁ ⲍⲱⲃ ⲛⲓⲗⲗ; clearly *suffert*, but without expressing ⲍⲏⲧ of *boh*.

The only thing that can have happened, as it seems, is that the $\overline{\text{ⲛ}}$ⲍⲏⲧ in *boh* was confused with ⲙⲉⲛⲣⲓⲧ and thus *diligit* found a place back in Greek! The place is worth studying.

The only other difference in *Mark's* quotation (thus probably from memory) is that he gives the order *παντα ελπιζει* (*printed* in Galland. *παντα ελιζει*, but there is no such word) *παντα πιστευει* for *παντα πιστευει παντα ελπιζει* against *Greek Latin boh* and *sah* order (but with *Isai Abb*). (One *boh* MS. omits *παντα πιστευει.*)

The interesting part is that it was hardly an *error oculi* of *Cypr* or *Marc mon*, for *aeth* CONFLATES, according to Tischendorf,

and therefore *acth*, later than either *Cypr* or *Marc mon*, found both readings somewhere.

[1 Cor. iii. 18. Instead of ει τις δοκει σοφος ειναι *etc.*, *Marc mon* gives (after δια τουτο φησιν ο αποστολος) : ο θελων γενεσθαι σοφος . . . . . for which there seems to be no authority, nor support in the coptics.]

[Eph. ii. 3 again is free, with ημεν γαρ ποτε και ημεις απειθουντας . . . . for "εν οις και ημεις παντες ανεστραφημεν . . . . "]

[Jas. iv. 6 again, the substitution of Κυριος for ο Θεος is not witnessed to by coptic, but *Tisch.* gives thirteen *Greek* copies, one lectionary, and *arm Antioch*[1099], without mentioning *Marc mon*.]

Rom. xii. 2 is given in full without variation from *text. recept.* except σχηματιζεσθε (so however no Greeks) for συσχηματιζεσθε.

(*Boh* separates : should no more share | fashion ⲛ̄ⲥϫⲏⲙⲁ being a separate word. But *sah* is in one word : ⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲧⲛ̄ⲧⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲓϩⲣⲃ̄.)

Eph. vi. 18 also has only the variation επαγρυπνουντες (for αγρυπνουντες) with greek 31 *Euthal.* (*Boh* ⲟⲩⲟϩ ⲉⲣⲉⲧⲉⲛⲟⲓ ⲛ̄ⲱⲣⲱⲓⲥ· ⲉϥⲁⲓ ϩⲉⲛ ⲙⲟⲩⲛ ⲛⲓⲃⲉⲛ [+ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ F[boh] K[boh]]. *mut. sah Balestri.*)

Phil. iv. 5/6 practically in full, but minus μετα ευχαριστιας which *boh* has, but apparently wanting in *sah*.

1 Pet. iv. 7 and 1 Pet. v. 7 form a continuous quotation.

In iv. 7 we notice προσευχας, — τας, with ℵAB and a few, but all *boh* MSS. have the article.

In v. 7 επιθεντες επι τον Θεον for επιρριψαντες επ αυτον. We can neglect τον Θεον for αυτον, allowing for the context, but for επιθεντες consult *boh* ⲟⲩⲁⲣϥ = *addere* rather than "cast all your care upon him" in the sense of επιθεντες, placing upon (note : ⲟⲩⲉϩ ⲣⲁⲧ "ponere pedem," *Peyron* p. 160).

(Eph. v. 14 is regular.)

Jas. i. 17 (Galland.[78]). κατερχομενη παρα του πατρος των φωτων for καταβαινον απο του πατρος των φωτων we have had before (Galland.[54]) where παρα occurred as well ; see note on that place, but καταβαινον was used there while κατερχομενη here. The *boh* ⲉⲩⲛⲏⲟⲩ ⲉⲡⲉⲥϩⲏⲧ emphasizes

the κατα (which we hold in both places) but really approximates ερχομενη rather than βαινον, = *cometh* (*sah* extant: ⲉϥⲛⲏⲩ ⲉⲡⲉϫⲏⲧ). To an Egyptian mind κατερχομενη would be a perfect synonym for καταβαινον.

Rom. xv. 2, 1 Cor. x. 32, Eph. vi. 6 call for no remark.

In Gal. i. 10 αρεσαι takes the place of αρεσκειν, and ηρεσκουν of ηρεσκον.

2 Cor. v. 15 is free: "ο παντων τον θανατον αναδεξαμενος και υπερ παντων αποθανων," the αναδεξαμενος being apparently imported from Heb. xi. 17 where Abraham is spoken of as offering Isaac.

Rom. iii. 23, 24 is thus given: οτι παντες (– γαρ with some *boh*) ημαρτον και υστερουμενοι (for υστερουνται) της δοξης του Θεου δικαιουμενοι δωρεαν τη αυτου χαριτι.

*Cf.* Horner's foot-note in *boh*.

Gal. vi. 7. For the usual ο γαρ εαν σπειρη ανθρωπος τουτο και θερισει, *Mark* writes και ο σπειρει εκαστος τουτο και θερισει. But this is only "free." *Cf. Orig* α σπειρει εκαστος ταυτα και θερισει. The εκαστος of *Marc mon* and *Orig* is not in *boh*. *Boh* says ⲡⲓⲣⲱⲙⲓ and *sah* ⲡⲣⲱⲙⲉ.

Rom. iii. 5/6 is without variation except at the beginning, where for ει δε η αδικια ημων Θεου, *Mark* says και ει ημων αδικια Θεου. He quotes again shortly after, saying: ει ουν η ημων αδικια. This ημων before αδικια is rather Egyptian than Greek.

1 Cor. ii. 9 as far as ανεβη (where *Mark* ceases) agrees word for word with Greek. The *boh* varies a little, using ⲟⲩⲁⲉ for και and so forth.

Col. i. 24 in full only varies with αναπληρω, for ανταναπληρω, with Greek FG four cursives and *Origen*, but has an addition των εθνων (after υπερ υμων) without authority. I hope I may be excused if I point out once more that this *could* have occurred from misreading *boh* ⲉϫⲉⲛ ⲑⲏⲡⲟⲩ (*sah* is ⲯⲁⲣⲱⲧⲛ̄).

2 Cor. i. 6, which has been rather a stumbling block to the editors, is thus given by *Marc mon*:

ειτε γαρ φησιν θλιβομεθα υπερ της υμων παρακλησεως και σωτηριας (– της ενεργουμενης εν υπομονη των αυτων παθηματων ων και ημεις πασχομεν) ειτε παρακαλουμεθα

υπερ της υμων σωτηριας και παρακλησεως (*pro* παρακλ. και σωτηρ.) [– και η ελπις ημων βεβαια υπερ υμων].

We can draw no real inferences from this. παρακλ. και σωτηρ. *prim.* is the order of *boh* while *boh* omits the second σωτηριας which we place after παρακλησεως with *gr* 37. In *boh* the clause της ενεργουμενης κ.τ.λ. follows the second παρακλησεως as in some Greeks. The inference is that it did so in *Mark's* copy and that he did not elide it but simply cut short his quotation at παρακλ. *secund.* (*Aeth* and *Gr* 42 give the order σωτηριας και παρακλησεως in the first place; B 17 176 omit και σωτηριας there).

1 John iii. 16 is thus given: "ει ο Κυριος την ψυχην αυτου υπερ ημων εθηκεν," continuing more regularly "οφειλομεν και ημεις τας ψυχας ημων υπερ των αδελφων τιθεναι."

*Boh* says *for one another* instead of υπερ των αδελφων but *sah* = for the brethren.

Gal. vi. 2 follows, with αναπληρωσετε with Greek BFG *latt boh sah aeth goth etc.*

1 Pet. iv. 12 agrees with ordinary text except for γινομενον instead of γινομενη.

Gal. v. 17, 16, quoted in this order, now supplies us in verse 17 with the ordinary το δε πνευμα for και το πνευμα on two previous occasions.

Verse 16 ends by *Mark* with ποτε. (No Greeks.) *Cf.* ⲉⲃⲟⲗ also at the end in *boh*. *Boh* says "and the lust of your flesh ye shall not fulfil out" (ⲟⲩⲟⲩ ϯⲉⲡⲓⲑⲩⲙⲓⲁ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲥⲁⲣⲝ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲭⲟⲕⲥ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ). This might have given rise to the ποτε as emphasis.

Col. ii. 21. *Mark*: μη αψη μη γευση μη θιγης exactly as our *A.V.*: *Touch not taste not handle not* for the Greek of the majority μη αψη μηδε γευση μηδε θιγης (as *R.V.*: *Handle not nor taste nor touch*). We can hardly draw an inference here. *Boh* goes with Gk majority having ⲟⲩⲗⲉ twice, and *sah* (Balestri) is unfortunately missing. It was easy to quote as *Mark* does. We find *Tertullian* doing it, six Greek cursives, *Origen* 1/2 and *Orig*$^{int}$, *Ambrose* often and *Ambrst*, yet most hold to the Greek.

[Mr. Horner shows me ⲟⲩⲗⲉ present *bis* in his *sah.*]

1 Cor. x. 11 (Galland.[88]) thus: ταυτα γαρ (*pro* ταυτα δε παντα) τυπικως (*pro* τυποι) συνεβαινεν (*pro* συνεβαινον)

εκεινοις· εγραφη δε προς νουθεσιαν ημων εις ους τα τελη των αιωνων κατηντησεν.

[παντα is omitted by Greek AB 17 *Marcion Tert Orig Dial Hipp Cyr Bas Chr* (*Ir*) *Pacian* and *sah*, but *not* by *boh*.

τυπικως is read by Gk ℵABCKP *al. Mcion Orig etc.* (*boh* ⲛ̄ⲧⲩⲡⲟⲥ · ⲛ̄ⲛⲏ, *sah* ⲛ̄ⲛⲏ ⲛ̄ⲧⲩⲡⲟⲥ).

συνεβαινεν is read by ℵBCKL *etc. Mcion Orig etc.*

We hold κατηντησεν against κατηντηκεν of ℵBD*FG 39 46 *Naas*[hipp] *Orig Bas Euthal Cyr*.]

But on Galland.[98] we read the quotation again thus: οτι ταυτα τυποι συνεβαινον εκεινοις· γεγραπται δε εις νουθεσιαν ημετεραν εις ους τα τελη των αιωνων κατηντησε.

We drop παντα again [*Orsiesius* does not]; we read συνεβαινον; we vary with γεγραπται; we use a new expression νουθεσιαν ημετεραν as the Latin; and we read εις for προς with ℵ* 31 *Epiph.* All this against coptic.

It is very rare for *Mark* to vary substantially when requoting the same passage. This is a marked exception.

Heb. vii. 2 (regular) is followed by Heb. vii. 13/14 where in ver. 13 αφ ης ουδεις προσεσχηκε τω θυσιαστηριω is elided, and in ver. 14 ημων after ὁ Κυριος is dropped. Not so *boh* nor Greek (*sah* wanting). *Mark* also adds ημων shortly after in a renewed quotation.

This is followed by Heb. vii. 3 partially (regular):

λεγει γαρ αφωμοιωμενος τω υιω Θεου μενει ιερευς εις το διηνεκες

and, after an interval, by the rest of the first part of the verse:

(δειξον πως) απατωρ και αμητωρ εστι (— αγενεαλογητος) μητε αρχην ημερων μητε ζωης τελος εχων αφωμοιωμενος δε τω υιω του Θεου.

This is intentionally free. The copula is not present in Greek or *boh*, nor do they drop αγενεαλογητος.

2 Cor. v. 16. Regular except for omission of και before εγνωκαμεν which agrees with *boh* (all mss.). [*Sah* wanting.]

Heb. vii. 4. He now takes up Heb. vii. again, and in this 4th verse substitutes εμερισεν *Αβρααμ* for *Αβρααμ* εδωκεν.

Compare as to position Greek A 37 73 116 εδωκεν *Αβρααμ* (*f vg* dedit de praecipuis Abraham) and *boh* ϥⲁⲓ ⲉⲧⲁϥϯⲣⲉⲙⲛⲧ ⲛⲁϥ ⲛ̄ⲭⲉⲁⲃⲣⲁⲁⲙ. (This εμερισεν probably came from verse 2 however; *boh*

differentiates, using ϕεϣ in verse 2 and ϯ as above in verse 4. I hardly think *Mark's* eye could be misled here by ⲣⲉⲙⲏⲧ (*decima pars*) but it is possible.)

*Mark* quotes the same verse 4 again however on the next page (Galland.[96]) : *αλλα θεωρειτε, φησι, πηλικος ουτος ω και δεκατην εμερισεν Αβρααμ*, repeating *εμερισεν Αβρααμ* although clearly verse 4 and not verse 2.

He now passes again to :

Heb. vii. 13/14. *εφ ον λεγεται ταυτα φυλης ετερας μετεσχηκε* (adding *και ουδεποτε πλανηθηση*, and omitting again *αφ ης ουδεις προσεσχηκε τω θυσιαστηριω*) *προδηλον γαρ οτι εξ Ιουδα ανατεταλκεν ο Κυριος ημων* (this time supplying *ημων*, and adding) *Ιησους Χριστος*.

(Gr 17 31 add *Ιησους*.)

He then passes back to :

Heb. v. 11, quoting verbatim *περι ου πολυς ημιν ο λογος και δυσερμηνευτος λεγειν*, stopping there and adding *ὦ τῆς ἀλαζονείας. δοκοῦντες εἶναι τῶν ἀποστόλων σοφώτεροι*, and continuing from :

1 Tim. i. 7 *ουτε νοουσιν α λεγουσιν ουτε περι τινων διαβεβαιουνται*

for the regular : *μη νοουντες μητε α λεγουσι μητε περι τινων διαβεβαιουνται*.

This is not uninteresting, for both *boh* and *sah* use the regular coptic ⲟⲩⲇⲉ for Greek *μηδε* with *Mark*. And *boh* favours *νοουσιν* against *νοουντες* (ⲛⲥⲉⲕⲁϯ ; *sah* : ⲛⲥⲉ ⲛⲟⲓⲉⲓ). Note *Epiph* 1/4 "*ου γαρ α λεγουσιν οιδασιν ουδε περι τινων διαβεβ.*"

Eph. iii. 5 is quite free :

*οτι ετεραις γενεαις, το μυστηριον τουτο* (this is supplied as end of previous verse *τω μυστηριω του Χριστου* is not quoted) *ουκ εγνωρισθη* (– *τοις υιοις των ανθρωπων*) *ως νυν απεκαλυφθη τοις αγιοις αποστολοις* (– *αυτου*) *και προφηταις* (– *εν πνευματι*). There is no authority for these changes.

2 Pet. ii. 1 as far as quoted agrees : (*οτι*) *εσονται ψευδοδιδασκαλοι οιτινες παρεισαξουσιν αιρεσεις απωλειας*.

After another brief reference to Heb. vii. 3, 2, 13, we get the quotation from :

Acts iv. 12 *οτι ουκ εστιν ονομα ετερον υπο τον ουρανον εν ω δει σωθηναι παντας ημας*, but *το δεδεμενον εν ανθρωποις* is

elided (freely) without authority, and *Mark* continues αλλα Κυριος Ιησους Χριστος and then drifts straight into :

Eph. i. 23 το πληρωμα του παντα εν πασι πληρουμενου (without variation), continuing very soon with :

2 Cor. xi. 4 (in full) ει μεν γαρ ο ερχομενος αλλον Ιησουν κηρυσσει ὃ (*pro* ὃν) ουκ εκηρυξαμεν ἢ πνευμα ετερον λαμβανετε ὃ ουκ ελαβετε ἢ ευαγγελιον ετερον ὃ ουκ εδεξασθαι καλως ανειχεσθε.

As regards this first ὃ for ὃν (against Greek) it is quite interesting to observe in both *sah* and *boh* that the manner of treating the threefold clause is the *same* in the coptic and shows no difference. Thus, *boh :*

ⲛⲕⲉⲓⲏⲥ ⲙⲡⲉⲛϩⲓⲱⲓϣ ⲙⲙⲟϥ
ⲛⲕⲉⲡⲛⲁ ⲙⲡⲉⲧⲉⲛϭⲓⲧϥ
ⲕⲉϥⲁⲅⲅⲉⲗⲓⲟⲛ ⲙⲡⲉⲧⲉⲛϣⲟⲡϥ.

1 Cor. ii. 2 thus freely : οτι ουδεν ετερον εκρινα ειδεναι ( – τι εν υμιν) ει μη Ιησουν Χριστον και τουτον εσταυρωμενον.

The regular Greek opens : ου γαρ εκρινα (του) ειδεναι τι εν υμιν.

(*Orig Ath* are also free here.)

The last quotation is from :

Col. ii. 9, 10. (ινα παλιν ζητησωμεν αλλαχου το πληρωμα) εν αυτω γαρ (ευδοκησε) κατοικησαι παν το πληρωμα της θεοτητος σωματικως και εσμεν (*pro* εστε) εν αυτω πεπληρωμενοι (παντες οι πιστευοντες τοις λογοις αυτου ως υιου Θεου . . . ).

The form is about the same employed more shortly before (Galland.[95]) where *Mark* wrote οτι ευδοκησεν εν αυτω κατοικησαι παν το πληρωμα της θεοτητος σωματικως.

*Perat*[hipp] *Monoimos*[hipp] also supply ευδοκησε.

It seems perfectly clear that *Mark* intended simply to use Greek forms throughout, yet unconsciously and subconsciously he lets us see enough of the 'hintergrund' of his mind to be sure that he was familiar with a coptic version or versions, and apparently at times drifts in thought or otherwise to both forms of *sahidic* and *bohairic*. At times, too, the agreement of *Mark* with *both* coptic versions is very distinct.

My excuse for re-examining this question is that Tischendorf, although quoting *Marc mon* fairly often in his apparatus, has not

done so throughout, and the complete picture is thus entirely lost.

Turning to *Serapion* we find several interesting touches.

### Serapion (*adv. Manich.*).

In the second quotation:

Matt. vii. 15 we have προσεχετε εαυτοις απο των ψευδοπροφητων . . . .

This εαυτοις is absent from all Greeks, but present in *boh* and *sah* (although only Englished by Horner for *sah*).

*Boh* = ⲁⲣⲉⲓ ⲁⲉ ⲉⲣⲱⲧⲉⲛ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲅⲁ ⲛⲓⲡⲣⲟⲫⲏⲧⲏⲥ ⲛ̄ⲛⲟⲩⲭ

*Sah* = ⲧⲅⲧⲏⲧⲛ̄ ⲉⲣⲱⲧⲛ̄ ⲉⲛⲉⲡⲣⲟⲫⲏⲧⲏⲥ ⲛ̄ⲛⲟⲩⲭ

(and in a few Old Latins, with *Lucifer* and *Gildas*, "vobis" is added after "Attendite").

1 Cor. vi. 19 (wrongly indexed in Galland. as iii. 16) is thus given:

ουκ οιδατε οτι τα σωματα υμων ναος του εν υμιν αγιου πνευματος εστιν.

The reading of ℵA*BCDEFGKP *d e f g syr*$^{sch}$ *Chr Thdrt* 1/2 *Orig*$^{int\ 4,\ 584}$ is το σωμα (*Tisch.* also quotes "*bashmuric*" for this), while *bohairic* (*sah* not extant) agrees with *Serapion* τα σωματα (ⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲥⲱⲙⲁ). A few Greeks give this, viz. A$^{2}$L some cursives *Orig ter* (*et Orig*$^{int\ 2,\ 409}$) *Meth Did Cyr Thdrt*$^{4,\ 391}$ and other Fathers. While this modification is quite likely in the Fathers' writings, we see from Matt. vii. 15 above that it was an Egyptian form which *Serapion* was following.

Matt. xxi. 31. οτι οι τελωναι και αι πορναι προαγουσιν υμας εις την βασιλειαν των ουρανων (*pro* του Θεου).

Here again we have this Egyptian muddle of των ουρανων for του Θεου (which can occur from proximity of the word for βασιλειαν in *bohairic* or from confusion of ⲙ̄ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ "of God" and ⲛ̄ⲙⲡⲏⲩⲉ "of the Heavens" in *sahidic*, as previously pointed out). Here *boh* retains "of God," but one *sahidic* MS. says ⲛ̄ⲙⲡⲏⲩⲉ with *arm* one MS. of *syr pesh* and *Irenaeus*. It is certainly not a Greek reading.

Rom. xii. 1. (τα δε λογια βοωντα και λεγοντα) παραστησατε τα σωματα υμων θυσιαν ζωσαν εναρεστον τω Θεω.

παραστησατε for παραστησαι is merely engendered by the introduction. The important part is the *order* of εναρεστον τω

Θεω, which *Tischendorf* and *Westcott-Hort* took the liberty of changing to τω Θεω ευαρεστον on the strength of ℵ*AP *vg*, but both coptics with ℵ^c BDEFGL *d e f g arm syr* witness with *Serapion* to ευαρεστον τω Θεω. Why did they abandon B^gr here, when *Serapion* (A.D. 350) contradicted ℵA ?

1 Tim. i. 15/16. *Serapion* omits πρωτω in verse 16 with D^gr* *d aeth.*

*Serapion* says αυτου μακροθυμιαν with *boh* and *sah* distinctly (as D^gr *d syr^sch Thdrt Aug* 1/5).

[Luke xii. 19. Thus : ψυχη εχεις αγαθα (– πολλα with *Orig ter*) κειμενα εις ετη πολλα· φαγε πιε ευφραινου (– αναπαυου with 36 *Clem bis*). (Tischendorf neglects *Serapion* in both places.) *Boh* and *sah* have πολλα *prim.* and αναπαυου, but one *boh* MS. (F_1*) omits αναπαυου.]

(2 Tim. iv. 9 is quoted without variation ; curiously enough *Serapion* gives this verse, while *Orsiesius* quotes the previous ones [*vide post*].)

Luke x. 17. A little thing occurs here showing, I think, that *sahidic* was under the eye of *Serapion.* He writes :

Κυριε ιδου και τα δαιμονια ημιν υποτασσεται.

The addition of ιδου is not found in Greek, nor in Latin, nor in Syriac, and is not present in *boh* nor in *sah. Boh* says "ⲭⲉ ⲡⲥ̅ⲥ̅ ⲛⲓⲕⲉⲇⲉⲙⲱⲛ," while *sah* is : "ⲭⲉ ⲡⲭⲟⲉⲓⲥ ⲛ̅ⲕⲉⲇⲁⲓⲙⲟⲛⲓⲟⲛ." I submit that it was this ⲉⲓⲥ (= ιδου in *boh* and *sahidic*) which engendered *Serapion's* + ιδου here. I consider this extremely interesting and incontrovertible. It might easily have been confused in a closely written uncial.

(John i. 43. Note that *Serapion* supports συ ει Σιμων ο υιος Ιωνα with AB^3ΧΓΔΛΠ *unc^9 al. mult. c q* (*gat*) *vg syr arm aeth Epiph Cyr Chr* with one *boh* MS. (the noteworthy M^boh) against rest of *boh* and *sah* who with Greek ℵB*L 33 *a b f ff_2 l am fu fossat etc.* have been followed by *Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Westcott-Hort,* with Ιωαννου).

Phil. iii. 8. Thus *Serapion,* exhibiting only part of the verse :

"παντα ηγουμαι σκυβαλα ινα Χριστον κερδησω."

This παντα, not present in Greek in this part of the verse, is found in Horner's text of *boh* and some *boh* MSS. ; *sah* (Balestri) is unfortunately mutilated here, but there is space to contain the

word (I think Mr. Horner's text will have it). εἶναι is omitted by *Serap* as *copt* and ℵ*BD*FG *d e f g vg arm aeth Lucif etc.*

### Palladius.

We may now consult *Palladius' Lausiac History* (ed. Butler, 1904).

Matt. ix. 11. Although in *Palladius* the sentence does not take
(Luke v. 30.) the form of a question, note that ὁ διδασκαλος ὑμων heads the clause in *Palladius*, while both *sah* and *boh* bring these words early in the sentence and not at the end as in the Greek.

Luke v. 31. *Palladius*: ὑγιαινοντες with Luke.

(Matt. ix. 12 / Mark ii. 17 = ἰσχυοντες.)

*Sah* in all three places = ⲛⲉⲧⲧⲏⲕ translated *healthy* by Horner, but Peyron only gives *fortis* as the equivalent, while *boh* in all three places = ⲉⲧϫⲟⲣ translated *strong* by Horner, but Peyron gives *fortis, potens, validus, solidus*, or *munitus*.

This place therefore remains quite indeterminate, as each coptic version uses its own word thrice over, while the Greek holds ἰσχυοντες in Matt. and Mark and has ὑγιαινοντες in Luke. Note that *Macarius* (*de caritate*) uses ὑγιαινοντες also.

Matt. xi. 18, 19. In verse 18 *Palladius* adds εν οδω δικαιοσυνης after ηλθεν Ιωαννης without *boh* or *sah* support, which is merely an importation from Matt. xxi. 32, showing how they used to combine Scripture.

Matt. xxiii. 9 or 10. *Pallad* reads:

μη καλεσητε διδασκαλον επι της γης.

Butler indexes this as xxiii. 9, but there is no variation from πατερα in xxiii. 9, both coptic versions having "Father."

But in verse 10 "μηδε κληθητε καθηγηται" *boh* says ⲉⲥⲁϥ = *scriba, doctor, magister* (Horner: "scribe"), and *sah* says ⲣⲉϥⲧⲥⲃⲱ = *doctor* (Horner: "teacher"), so that διδασκαλον of *Palladius* savours very strongly of retranslation.

Mark ii. 18. *Pallad* is short and free, giving:

ινα τι μαθηται σου ου νηστευουσιν ως και οι του Ιωαννου

for the longer phrase (with variations) of other authorities.

Luke ix. 62. This verse has many variations in Gk and in all the Versions.

*Pallad*: ουδεις επιβαλων την χειρα ( – αυτου) επ αροτρον και στραφεις εις τα οπισω ευθετος εστιν εις την βασιλειαν των ουρανων.

*Palladius* thus omits αυτου with $B^{gr}$ *fam*$^{1}$ *a b q Orig Bas Cyr Tert*, but against *boh* and *sah*. στραφεις for βλεπων is read by a dozen cursives, by *Orig Cyr Chr Antioch Dam* and *Mark the hermit*. In this connection the latter absolutely confirms *Palladius*' text here at a simultaneous epoch. (*Cf.* "retro adtendens" of *c e Cypr.*) But *boh* = ϫⲟⲩⲱⲧ "respicere," as *sah.* εις την βασιλειαν is the reading of most Greeks (*sah* ⲉⲧⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲣⲟ), but $\aleph^{c}$ 131 *q Valent ap. Iren Bas Chr* and *Mark the hermit* prefer εν τη βασιλεια (*boh* ϩⲉⲛ ⲧⲙⲉⲧⲟⲩⲣⲟ), while $\aleph^{*}$BLΞ 1 33 and most *latt* have merely τη βασιλεια.

The close, however, is really the important part for us here, for *Palladius* writes των ουρανων instead of του Θεου, while *boh* is distinct with ⲛ̄ⲧⲉ ⲫⲧ thereagainst and *sah* ⲙ̄ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ. This is in the nature of a key, and *Pallad* has support from *Valent apud Iren*, *Cyr*$^{ador}$ and *Mark the hermit*, who read also των ουρανων with Horner's bohairic catena ℵ.

We have noticed and pointed out several times how such substitutions occurred from the proximity of ⲙⲉⲧⲟⲩⲣⲟ in coptic. It occurs in Greek A and in the new Freer Greek W, and I think also in Greek ℵ. To find it in *Palladius*, supported by coptic catena ℵ with *Mark the monk* lends decided force to our remarks, and this would rather point to *Palladius* having had before him a graeco-coptic version, and having also confused ⲙⲉⲧⲟⲩⲣⲟ with *ουρανων* like the others.†

John v. 14. This short quotation agrees with the usual Greek text: ιδε υγιης γεγονας (*boh sah* ⲁⲕⲟⲩⲭⲁⲓ) μηκετι αμαρτανε.

Rom. i. 28, 21, 26. *Pallad* writes:

"επειδη γαρ [28] ουκ εδοκιμασαν τον Θεον εχειν εν επιγνωσει παρεδωκεν αυτους ο Θεος εις αδοκιμον νουν ποιειν τα μη καθηκοντα" (περι δε ετερων τινων των δοκουντων εχειν γνωσιν Θεου μετα διεφθαρμενης γνωμης· Επειδη γαρ)

† Scribal confusion is also possible in *sahidic* between 'God' and 'Heaven.'

(21) "γνοντες τον Θεον ουχ ως Θεον εδοξασαν η ηυχαριστησαν
(28) παρεδωκεν αυτους ο Θεος εις παθη ατιμιας."

The whole of this runs as usual, επειδη γαρ for και καθως in ver. 28 and for διοτι in ver. 21 being merely used for an apposite introduction here.

Rom. xiv. 23. παν γαρ ο ουκ εκ πιστεως αμαρτια εστιν.

The only difference here is γαρ for δε (*boh* also ⲁⲉ, *sah* Balestri wanting [but Horner shows me ⲁⲉ for *sah*]) which is negligible.

1 Cor. iii. 18 runs with the ordinary text. The *Pallad* MSS. are divided as to εν υμιν or εν ημιν. (*Copt* goes with Greek εν υμιν.)

1 Cor. vi. 9. *Pallad* οτι αδικοι βασιλειαν Θεου ου κληρονομησουσι. The order βασ. Θεου agrees with *boh* (*sah* not extant) Greek L *etc. d e f vg Clem etc. Tert Cypr* AGAINST ℵABCDEP who write Θεου βασιλειαν. This holds *Pallad* down to graeco-copt again.

1 Cor. vii. 16. τι γαρ οιδας, γυναι, ει τον ανδρα σωσεις agrees with the usual Gk text. *Boh* has ϫⲉ ⲁⲣⲏⲟⲩ for ει = *si forsan*, not emphasized here at all by *Palladius*.

1 Cor. ix. 25. Merely a line: πας ο αγωνιζομενος παντα εγκρατευεται. The ordinary text has πας δε as all *boh* MSS. but one, which omits ⲁⲉ. Balestri's *sah* (extant here) has it.

2 Cor. xii. 5. υπερ του τοιουτου καυχησομαι. Merely a short interjection here, followed by οἷος ἦν οὗτος. But this Greek order is contrary to the coptic one.

2 Cor. xii. 7. εδοθη μοι σκολοψ τη σαρκι αγγελος σαταν ινα με κολαφιζη ινα μη υπεραιρωμαι.

This again follows Greek (exactly as *Macarius* does) and does not supply εν before τη σαρκι as *boh*, nor anything before αγγελος, while *boh* (not *sah*) writes ⲡϫⲉⲟⲩⲁⲅⲅⲉⲗⲟⲥ = *namely* an angel. *Sah* writes ⲉⲧⲁⲥⲁⲣ̄ⲝ for τη σαρκι.

Gal. i. 18. *Pallad*: "ανεβην" (*pro* επειτα μετα ετη τρια ανηλθον) "εις ιεροσολυμα ιστορησαι κηφαν" (*pro* πετρον).

This is distinctly *Greek* as regards ιστορησαι, for all *boh* with Balestri's *sah* have merely ⲉⲡⲁⲩ. Both *boh* and *sah* have ⲕⲏⲫⲁ with *Palladius* and with Gk ℵ*AB against the other Greeks.

While *boh* has ⲉⲓⲗ̄ⲏⲙ̄, *sah* has ⲉⲑⲓⲉⲣⲟⲥⲟⲗⲩⲙⲁ.

As regards ανεβην, for which no Greek support in Tischen-

dorf, *cf. Aug Ambrst* "adscendi." *Boh* = ⲁⲓⲱⲉ (ⲛⲏⲓ) ⲉⲃⲣⲏⲓ and *sah* ⲁⲓⲃⲱⲕ ⲉⲃⲣⲁⲓ, in both cases emphasizing the Gk *ἀνά*.

An indecisive but rather a pretty place as regards composite treatment.

It is rather curious that both coptics are content with *videre* for *ιστορησαι*, which is very *latin* sympathy.

Gal. iii. 28. *εν Χριστω Ιησου ουκ ενι αρσεν και θηλυ.*

The *εν Χριστω Ιησου* is supplied from the context. Otherwise there is no comment to make, except that *boh* writes ⲟⲩⲗⲉ for *και* before *θηλυ* against *Palladius* and the Greek (*sah* Balestri not extant).

Gal. v. 22/23. *Pallad:* "*οτι το καρπος*" (*των λογω πολιτευομενων και συνεσει κατα τον θειον αποστολον*) "*αγαπη εστι και χαρα και ειρηνη και μακροθυμια, χρηστοτης, αγαθωσυνη, πιστις, πραϋτης και εγκρατεια*" (*ωμολογηται. αυτος γαρ ελεγε Παυλος·*) "*ο γαρ καρπος του πνευματος εστι*" (*τα και τα*).

*Sah* is not extant in Balestri, so I do not know, unless Mr. Horner has this section, whether *sah* couples any of the list. The order is perfect Greek and Bohairic order and is either copied out or the writer had it perfectly in his memory. The only difference *boh* makes is to say *a* love, *a* joy, *a* peace, and thus throughout using the indefinite article ⲟⲩ which might be taken for the copula ⲟⲩⲟϩ (especially in ⲟⲩϩⲓⲣⲏⲛⲏ), which it will be noticed the writer drops after *μακροθυμια* [he might have paused there as *boh* expresses it ⲟⲩⲙⲉⲧⲣⲉϥⲱⲟⲩ ⲛ̄ϩⲏⲧ] and does not use again until at the last, where ⲟⲩⲙⲉⲧⲣⲉⲙⲙⲁⲩⲱ ⲟⲩⲉⲅⲕⲣⲁⲧⲓⲁ might have suggested to the eye ⲛⲉⲙⲙ or ⲟⲩⲟϩ.

The *boh* writes thus:

ϥⲁⲓ ⲡⲉ: ⲟⲩⲁⲅⲁⲡⲏ· ⲟⲩⲣⲁⲱⲓ· ⲟⲩϩⲓⲣⲏⲛⲏ· ⲟⲩⲙⲉⲧⲣⲉ-ϥⲱⲟⲩ ⲛ̄ϩⲏⲧ· ⲟⲩⲙⲉⲧⲭ̄ⲣ̄ⲥ̄· ⲟⲩⲙⲉⲧⲁⲅⲁⲑⲟⲥ· ⲟⲩⲛⲁϩϯ· ⲟⲩⲙⲉⲧⲣⲙⲙⲁⲩⲱ· ⲟⲩⲉⲅⲕⲣⲁⲧⲓⲁ.

[Since this was written Mr. Horner for *sah* has shown me: ⲡⲉ ⲧⲁⲅⲁⲡⲏ ⲡⲣⲁⲱⲉ ⲉⲓⲣⲏⲛⲏ ⲧⲙ̄ⲛ̄ⲧϩⲁⲣⲱϩⲏⲧ ⲧⲙ̄ⲛ̄ⲧⲭ̄ⲣ̄ⲥ̄ ⲙ̄ⲛ̄ⲧⲡⲉⲧⲛⲁⲟⲩϥ ⲧⲡⲓⲥⲧⲓⲥ ⲧⲙ̄ⲛ̄ⲧⲣⲙⲙⲁⲩⲱ ⲧⲉⲅⲕⲣⲁⲧⲓⲁ, so that *sah* does not couple, and uses the definite article.]

Phil. i. 23. *Pallad:* (*αγαθον pro την επιθυμιαν εχων*) "*το αναλυσαι και συν Χριστω ειναι*"

This is rather more Greek than coptic. *Boh* says (some MSS.) ⲛ̄ⲧⲁϥⲱⲡⲓ ⲛⲉⲙⲙ ⲡⲭ̄ⲥ̄, others: ⲟⲩⲟϩ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁϥⲱⲡⲓ ⲛⲉⲙⲙ ⲡⲭ̄ⲥ̄,

all bringing the *ειναι* before *Χριστω*, some retaining and some dropping *και*.

*Sah* ⲉⲱⲱⲡⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡ̄ ⲡⲉⲭ̄ⲥ̄ dropping *και*.

2 Thess. iii. 8. Only two words "*δωρεαν αρτον*" (*φαγων*), but it is greek order against *αρτον δωρεαν* of *boh* (*sah* wanting in Balestri; Horner shows me agreement of *sah* with *boh* here).

1 Tim. i. 9. "*δικαιω*" (*γαρ*) "*νομος ου κειται.*"

*boh* is ⲭⲉ ⲛⲁⲣⲉ ⲡⲓⲛⲟⲙⲟⲥ ⲭⲏ (ⲙ̄ⲡⲓⲑⲙⲏⲓ ⲁⲛ)

*sah* ⲭⲉ ⲛⲉⲣⲉ ⲡⲛⲟⲙⲟⲥ ⲕⲏ (ⲁⲛ ⲉⲃⲣⲁⲓ ⲙ̄ⲡⲗⲓⲕⲁⲓⲟⲥ).

1 John ii. 18. Merely: "*παιδια*" (*γεγραπται προ τετρακοσιων ετων οτι*) "*εσχατη ωρα εστι.*"

As *boh*: ⲛⲓⲁⲗⲱⲟⲩⲓ ⲧⲫⲁⲉ ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩ ⲧⲉ.

*sah*: ⲛⲁⲱⲏⲣⲉ ⲑⲁⲏ ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩ ⲧⲉ.

I have thought it worth while to recapitulate these passages as Dom Butler in his long and excellent study of the Lausiac History has not taken up these matters point by point, and while much makes for his contention of basic Greek, there is an undercurrent of coptic visible at times.

## Evagrius.

We can also consult Evagrius (*Capita practica*), who, although only a transient foreigner in Egypt, should not be neglected.

The very second quotation:

John v. 44, yields *ζητουντες fin.* (for *ζητειτε*) which both *Macarius* and *Marc mon* exhibit with ℵ* and ten cursives.

Matt. vi. 5. *οταν προσευχησθε* (or *προσευχεσθε*) *ουκ εσεσθε* for *οταν προσευχη ουκ εση* agrees with *boh* and *sah* ℵ*·et C BZ 1 22 118 *it vg aeth arm* against the majority of Greeks.

Some mss. of *Evagr.* as Galland. txt. add *ποιουσι* after *υποκριται* without apparent authority, illegitimately doubling the verb. For *εν ταις γωνιαις των πλατειων Evagr* substitutes *εν ταις πλατειαις* (some mss. and Galland. text) against *Gk*, *boh*, and *sah* and apparently only with *Augustine*.

Matt. vi. 16. *εσεσθε* (*pro γινεσθε*). No Greeks apparently, but coptic also uses same word as above in verse 5.

*ibid.* — *οτι* with ℵBD 1 22 118 124 *al.*[6] *a b f h k m q arm aeth Aug*

against bulk of the Greeks *c ff*$_1$ *g*$_{1,2}$ *vg* and *boh sah* which naturally have it. Here is rather a pretty diversity in the same verse. *Evagr* first with and then against coptic.

Col. iii. 10 is shortened and rather free; (interposing a reference to Gal. iii. 28) he continues verse 11, and when he reaches βαρβαρος says "βαρβαρος και Σκυθης, δουλος και ελευθερος, αλλα παντα (— τα) και εν πασι Χριστος.

This βαρβαρος και Σκυθης δουλος και ελευθερος is exhibited partially by coptic.

*Boh* says: ⲃⲁⲣⲃⲁⲣⲟⲥ ⲥⲕⲩⲑⲟⲥ ⲃⲱⲕ ⲟⲩⲟⲍ ⲣⲉⲙⲍⲉ

*Sah* says: ⲃⲁⲣⲃⲁⲣⲟⲥ · ⲥⲕⲩⲑⲏⲥ ⲍⲙ̄ⲙ̄ⲍⲁⲗ · ⲣⲙ̄ⲣⲉ.

Thus *sah* uses ⲍⲙ̄ⲙ̄ⲍⲁⲗ for ⲃⲱⲕ of *boh*, and this ⲍⲙ̄ⲙ̄ may have influenced a copula. Notice *boh* has ⲟⲩⲟⲍ following between ⲃⲱⲕ (δουλος) and ⲣⲉⲙⲍⲉ (ελευθερος), while *sah* does not have it.

As to βαρβαρος και Σκυθης support is found by Greek D*E* FG *d e f g vg goth* and *Petr Alex.* The Greeks AD*E*FG 3 46 73 *it vg goth aeth* also add και between δουλος and ελευθερος. As regards παντα (— τα) of *Evagr* it has support of ℵ*AC *Clem.*

*boh* is ⲁⲗⲗⲁ ⲍⲱⲃ ⲛⲓⲃⲉⲛ ϩⲉⲛ ⲟⲩⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲃⲉⲛ ⲡ$\overline{\text{ⲭ}}\overline{\text{ⲥ}}$

and *sah* ⲁⲗⲗⲁ ⲡⲧⲏⲣ$\overline{\text{ⲟ}}$ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲡⲉⲧⲍⲙ̄ⲙ̄ ⲡⲧⲏⲣ$\overline{\text{ⲟ}}$ ⲡⲉ ⲡⲉ$\overline{\text{ⲭ}}\overline{\text{ⲥ}}$.

Matt. xiii. 24. *Evagr* writes εν τω ιδιω αγρω with D$^{gr}$ *Eus*$^{bis}$ (for εν τω αγρω αυτου). In coptic the possessive precedes the noun; Horner mentions D *Eus* in his sahidic notes. These things are lost if we do not consider contemporary evidence. Neither *Tisch.* nor *Horner* mention *Evagrius'* confirmation of this reading.

(Eph. vi. 17, 14, 16, is merely a paraphrase.)

(2 Tim. ii. 12 and Rom. vi. 8 are involved together.)

Evagrius (*Rerum Monach. rationes*):

1 Cor. vii. 33, 34, is thus given:

ο γαμησας ανθρωπος μεριμνα τα του κοσμου πως αρεσει τη γυναικι και μεμερισται· και η γαμησασα γυνη μεριμνα τα του κοσμου πως αρεσει τω ανδρι.

Although rather free and eliding part of verse 34, it will be noticed that τη γυναικι και μεμερισται. (instead of τη γυναικι. μεμερισται) agrees with *boh.* (*Cf. Isai Abb infra.*)

2 Tim. ii. 4 following, shows no variation;

while Matt. xi. 30, Luke x. 41, 42 are memorial;

and Mark xii. 44 (Luke xxi. 4) is thus referred to:

εκεινοι μεν γαρ (φησιν) εκ του περισσευματος εβαλον εν τω γαζοφυλακιω, αὐτη δε, απασαν εαυτης την υπαρξιν.

2 Cor. viii. 14, 15, in full, shows no variation except καθα γεγραπται for καθως γεγραπται. *Cf. boh* ⲕⲁⲧⲁ ⲫⲣⲏϯ ⲉⲧⲥⲫⲏⲟⲩⲧ. Greeks do not vary καθως.

Matt. viii. 22 (somewhat blended with the order in Luke ix. 60) is given as:

αφες (φησιν) ο Κυριος τους νεκρους θαψαι τους εαυτων νεκρους· συ δε δευρο ακολουθει μοι. See *Clem* as to this, as also *syr* S.

Matt. xii. 50. This next quotation, freely inverted:

μητηρ μου και αδελφοι μου και πατερες ουτοι εισιν οι ποιουντες το θελημα του πατρος μου του εν τοις ουρανοις

also agrees with *Clem.*

*Evagrius* closes with Rom. viii. 18, regular, to all intents and purposes.

From the testimony of Mark the monk, whether familiar with *boh* or *sah* (and it would appear that he knew *both*) we have seen how *Latin c d e ff*$_2$ *l* intrude into the Egyptian text.

We must bear in mind that some of the monks in the Egyptian monastery regions only knew Latin. In *Proleg.* to *Orsiesius'* life and writings in *Galland.*, vol. v., p. viii.:—

"Siquidem in praefatione ad Regulam Sancti Pachomii quam sub finem praecedentis voluminis excudendam curavimus, haec habet Doctor maximus: *Accepi libros ab homine Dei Silvano presbytero mihi directos quos ille Alexandria missos susceperat ut etiam injungeret transferendos. Ajebat enim quod in Thebaidis cœnobiis—habitarent plurimi Latinorum qui ignorarent Ægyptiacum Græcumque sermonem, quo Pachomii et Theodori et Orsiesii præcepta conscripta sunt.* Paucisque interjectis: *Itaque*, subdit, *accito notario, ut erant de Ægyptiaca in Græcam linguam versa, nostro sermone dictavi.* Praefationem vero suam claudit sanctus Doctor his verbis: *Simplicitatem Ægyptii sermonis imitati sumus,—ne viros apostolicos et totos gratiae spiritalis sermo rhetoricus immutaret. Cetera autem quae* IN EORUM TRACTATIBUS *continentur praelibare nolui ut in suis discantur* AUCTORIBUS; *et de fontibus potius quam de rivulis bibant, quos sanctae conversationis studia delectant.* Huc usque Hieronymus.

"Ex quibus ergo compertum fit ut equidem arbitror sanctum

Doctorem non solum Pachomii et Theodori set etiam *Orsiesii*, quorum nempe paullo ante simul meminerat, litterarum monimenta Latine vertisse. Accedit praeterea eorumdem patrum Ægyptiorum scripta saeculo V desinente Latinis innotuisse ut ex Gennadio erudimur (de Vir. illustr. vii/ix); qui quidem nonnisi ex versione Hieronymiana ejusmodi notitiam sibi demum comparasse merito existimantur. Neque aliter hac de re censuit cl. Tillemontius.

"Quae quum ita se habeant, in postrema operum sancti Doctoris editione Veronensi opportunum fortasse locum nacta fuisset haec Orsiesii Doctrinae Hieronymiana versio; eo scilicet nomine quo eruditissimus editor Pachomii Regulam nec non ejusdem ac Theodori epistolas illuc primus invexit. Horum namque trium sanctorum abbatum Tabennensium opera Graece reddita junctim *ab homine Dei Silvano presbytero accepit* sanctus Doctor eaque simul *ut erant de Ægyptiaca in Graecam linguam versa proprio sermone dictavit*, ut modo ab eo accepimus.

"Quod superest, *Orsiesii* 'Doctrinam' ex codice Regularum Holsteniano editionis Romanae descripsimus; libellum vero *de sex cogitationibus sanctorum*, ex Thesauro Canisiano."

At any rate we have seen what the writings of *Macarius*, *Mark*, and *Serapion* have yielded as regards a coptic current in their day, and what may still be gleaned from the few words which the traveller *Evagrius* has to say [the latter neglected by Tischendorf even when in agreement with *Clement*], for the latter represents a foreign element in temporary residence among the Egyptian monks.

And we can close with a reference to *Orsiesius*' Latin testimony.

His testimony is slightly complicated by a possible Vulgatizing of part of his texts, but yet a good deal of interest is visible. His quotations are of rather a peculiar type: sometimes unduly free, at others exact.

### Orsiesius.

Thus Gal. v. 15 *ad* invicem for *ab* invicem appears new, as does *ut* dividat eum in Matt. xxiv. 51 *init.* As regards Matt. xxv. 21, 23, which *Orsiesius* gives as *super modicum* in the singular against Greeks and Latins, but rather with *in modico* of *syr*, *copt* is rather indeterminate and would bear either, but holds the *in* as *d* "in paucis." Luke ii. 9 venit ad eos is new; Eph. iv. 30 + justi judicii *post* redemtionis *fin.* is new; 2 Cor. viii. 15 parum *pro*

modicum is new; as Rom. xiv. 4 + rursum, Phil. iv. 6 in oratione intenti; 1 Cor. xi. 22 ut libatis et comedatis, order against *greek sah boh* and *lat*; John xxi. 6 — το δικτυον.

Eph. iv. 30, in die redemptionis *Orsiesius* (for εις ημεραν απολυτρωσεως or *in diem redempt.*) with *Vigil Taps*, and *Tert* alone (in redemptionis die) does not agree with *copt.*

Act. xx. 28 is very free:

"*super quem* vox spiritus sanctus constituit *inspicere et* pascere Ecclesiam Dei quam acquisivit proprio sanguine."

John xiv. 21/23 opens "*qui audit* mandata mea" (against *boh sah* and *greek* ο εχων) and has Old Latin support *b c fossat aur* and *Lucifer Maximin Cassiod.*

The close is mixed and free like *Macarius'* quotations of the same place.

Luke ii. 52 is very free "puer autem ibat et crescebat et proficiebat apud Deum et apud hominibus."

As regards the second *apud*, $D^{gr}$ does this and *syr arm aeth. Boh* says ⲛⲉⲗⲗ ⲛⲓⲣⲱⲙⲓ (supplying the article, which Greek lacks) as does *sah.*

Acts xx. 32: "cum sanctis" (for εν τοις ηγιασμενοις πασιν) is new.

2 Tim. iv. 6/8. In verse 8 "*qui dilexerunt* JUSTITIAM *ejus*" is noteworthy. Greek is τοις ηγαπηκοσι την επιφανειαν αυτου. *Latt* "adventum (*al.* manifestationem) ejus."

As regards the Vulgate see Col. iii. 13. *Orsiesius* quotes "sicut et Christus *donavit* (for εχαρισατο) nobis sic facite."

This *donavit* is *vg* and *it* but not *copt* (= ϫω).

It is very interesting to examine *Orsiesius* in full, but it would take too much space. As to *coptic* note:

Matt. xxiii. 4. . . . et imponitis *ea* super humeros hominum . . . with *boh* and *sah* against Greek and Latin.

1 Cor. xi. 2 thus: Laudo autem vos *quod in omnibus* meministis mei et sicut tradidi vobis traditiones *meas* custodistis.

This *in omnibus* is distinctly *coptic* (*boh*: ϩⲉⲛ ϩⲱⲃ ⲛⲓⲃⲉⲛ, *sah*: ϩⲛ̄ ϩⲱⲃ ⲛⲓⲗⲗ) *against* Greek παντα and Latin *omnia.*

The "*meas*" is Latin (*it* and *vg*) with only Greek D*FG, but compare *sah.*

1 Pet. iii. 15. parati estote ad respondendum *omnibus qui a vobis exigunt rationem* super ea fide quae in vobis est.

Greek is παντι τω αιτουντι υμας λογον,
Latin is *omni poscenti vos rationem,*
but *cf. boh* ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲃⲉⲛ ⲉⲑⲛⲁⲉⲣⲉⲧⲓⲛ ⲙ̄ⲙⲱⲧⲉⲛ ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲥⲁϫⲓ.

(*Did. libere*: ως εν παντι καιρω απαιτουμενους ημας του περι αυτης λογον.)

In John x. 11/13 note "ovibus *suis*" in verse 11 with *boh sah* (and *vg*) against Greek.

In verse 12 *Orsiesius* omits *propriae* (ιδια).

(John xxi. 15, 16, is thus given: [15] Simon Joannis diligis me plus his? *Respondit* ei (– Ναι Κυριε) Domine tu scis quia *ego* diligo te. Dicit ei *Jesus* pasce agnos meos. [16] Dicit ei rursus secundo Simon Joannis diligis me. *Respondit* ei etiam Domine tu scis quia *diligam* te. Dicit ei pasce *oves* meas.

The variations marked by italics appear free, except the last which is latin and coptic, *oves* for τα προβατα).

Luke xii. 35/37 free also. "similes *servorum*" agrees with *Isaiah Abb* "sicut *servi*" for the "men" of all others.

(1 Cor. x. 11 omits παντα (on Galland.[43]) with *Marc mon,* but has it on p. 40.)

Eph. vi. 11, 12, thus:

induamur *potius* armaturam Dei ut possimus resistere contra *insidias* diaboli. Non est enim pugna contra *carnem et sanguinem* sed adversus potestates *et* principatus, adversus rectores tenebrarum harum, adversus spiritalia nequitia in caelestibus.

*potius* appears new.

*insidias* (*for* μεθοδειας or μεθοδιας) goes with *e f g vg* (remedia *Lucif,* remedium *d,* machinationes *Tert*[marc]; versutias *Hier* = ⲛⲓⲕⲟⲧⲥ *copt*).

*carnem et sanguinem* (against all Greeks αιμα και σαρκα and *sah*: ⲥⲛⲟϥ ⲉⲓ ⲥⲁⲣⲝ) is the Vulgate (against *Hier* himself on Eph. vi. 12) as well as *bohairic* order (ⲥⲁⲣⲝ ⲉⲓ ⲥⲛⲟϥ). This we retain in English, A.V. being *flesh and blood* (against Greek), and strangely enough the Revised Version retained this.† It

† Wiclif, even Tynedale (flesshe and bloud), Geneva, Rheims, all have *flesh and blood*, but the Great Bible of 1539 had revised Tynedale to *bloude and fleshe*, which was however not allowed to stand.

is impossible to connect *Orsiesius* here with *boh*, as *vg* and many Latins have the order. *Isai Abb* also has the order of *boh vg*.

"*Et* principatus" is against most *Gr* and *Latin* and *boh*, but *with sah* ⲙⲛ̄ ⲛⲉⲝⲟⲩⲥⲓⲁ and D$^{gr}$ E$^{gr}$ *f vg*; so also *Isai Abb*, so it is probably *ex vg*.

Gal. v. 13. Vos autem in libertatem vocati estis (— αδελφοι) tantum ne libertate in occasionem carnis *abutamini* sed *caritate* (*pro* δια της αγαπης) servite invicem.

Note the addition of *abutamini*. No Greeks supply a verb except FG: δωτε, following the Latin *detis* of *f g vg* and Fathers, but *cf. boh*.

Matt. vi. 24 } Nemo potest duobus dominis servire; aut
Luke xvi. 13 } enim unum odio habebit et alterum diliget; aut uni *est obediens* et contemnet alterum. Non potestis Deo servire et mammonae.

*Cf. f* (Matt.) (*Hier*) *goth* (Matt.) and *boh* (Luke) for *est obediens* against *sah* and Greeks. (See remarks in my edition of the Morgan MS. where I omitted to note *Orsiesius*' testimony.) *Aeth* in both places goes with *Orsiesius*.

1 Tim. vi. 6/10. Verse 8 *victum et vestitum* [for Gk διατροφας (διατροφην DFGKP *Orig*) και σκεπασματα] is Old Latin, but also coptic, and *boh* emphasizes with *a food and a raiment*. *Vg* goes with Gk into the plural.

John. xi. 9, 10. impingit *bis pro* offendit *latt* (Gr. προσκοπτει). *Cf. copt.*

John. xiv. 27. Pacem *meam* do vobis, pacem meam relinquo vobis.

So *boh* and *sah* (emphatic) and some Latins (against Gk). Continuing "Non sicut mundus dat *pacem* ego do vobis." This *pacem* appears unauthorized.

John xv. 18. – υμων *Orsiesius* with ℵ*D *a b c e ff*$_2$ *boh arm aeth Cypr* 2/4.

[*Contra* ℵ$^c$ABILNX *rell f g l q vg syr omn goth sah Cyr.*]

Luke vi. 25. + nunc (*post* saturati estis) with ℵBLQRX Δ*ΛΞ *al. min. pauc. f goth boh sah arm aeth.*

[*Contra* ADEHKMPSUVΓΠ *al. mult. a b c e g*$_2$ *l q syr pesh vg Iren Bas.*]

(Heb. xiii. 16. Bonorum operum (suppressing *et*) communionis oblivisci nolite; talibus enim victimis placetur Deo.

No Greeks omit και ("της δε ευποιας και κοινωνιας μη . . .") nor Latins.

*Boh* and *sah* both use the coptic equivalent "with." "But beneficence *with* the sharing forget not." *Orsiesius* remains alone apparently.)

1 John iii. 12/14. Non sicut Cain, qui (*cf. latt* and *copt*) ex maligno erat et occidit fratrem suum. Et quare occidit? (– eum *cum Aug, cf. copt*). Quia opera ejus maligna erant; fratris autem ejus *bona* [without authority; *boh* ϩⲁⲛⲁⲓⲕⲉⲟⲛ, *sah* ϩⲉⲛⲁⲓⲕⲁⲓⲟⲛ]. Non admiremur, fratres, si oderit *nos* (*sah Aug Lucif*) mundus; nos scimus quia transivimus de morte ad vitam eo quod diligamus fratres.

## Isaiah Abbott.

As to *Isai Abb* at first it appeared to me that there might have been considerable Vulgatizing of the quotations of this witness. But after going through the whole apparatus, I am inclined to think that *most* of the *vg* agreement with *Isai* is basic, because at times we get right away from the Vulgate Latin in most interesting and important places.

Thus: *mutua* for *commoda* in Luke xi. 5/8 is definite in this connection. See *boh* and *sah*.

Note particularly Eph. vi. 11/12 and 1 Cor. xiii. 12 *boh* against *sah*; Matt. vi. 12, 14, Heb. iv. 10, Rom. ii. 29, 2 Cor. iii. 18, 1 Cor. xv. 50. Also:

John xii. 26 with one *boh* MS. $D_2$ alone.
2 Pet. i. 9 „ „ „ „ K „
1 Cor. xi. 10 „ five „ MSS.
John xiv. 16 „ one „ MS. A and Horner's text.

For details of these and other places consult what follows.

Matt. v. 25, 26, in full. Omits ταχυ without authority (only *Ambr* 1/2), but agrees with most Greeks and *boh s. h it vg syr goth* adding σε παραδω after κριτης (et judex tradat te) against ℵB 1 13 *k arm aeth*.

John xiv. 27. Inverting (twice thus he quotes): "pacem meam do vobis, pacem meam relinquo vobis"; he gives

us *meam* twice as *boh sah aeth* and *Orsiesius* and some Latins (against Greek).

(Matt. xxv. 34, 35, 41, 44, 40 [this wrongly indexed as 45] is fairly regular, but the last is free "qui bene facit uni ex his *qui in me credunt* mihi fecit.")

(John xiii. 35. "In hoc (inquit) cognoscent omnes *vos* meos esse discipulos si dilectionem habueritis *inter vos.*"

*Vos* is supplied against *Gk* and *copt*; *inter vos* is not the coptic method here, nor Greek (εν αλληλοις) but ℵ has μετ αλληλων [*Latt plur.* "ad invicem" (none "inter vos") while *fossat*: "ad invicem ad alterutrum"] See second quotation later.

[John xiv. 23. (twice thus) "Qui diligit me *mandata mea* servabit." This plural is not countenanced by *Greek*, *copt*, or *latin*.]

Eph. vi. 11, 12, in full thus:

"Induite *vos* (inquit Apostolus) armaturam Dei ut possitis stare adversus insidias diaboli. Quoniam non est nobis colluctatio adversus *carnem et sanguinem* sed adversus principes *et* potestates, adversus mundi rectores tenebrarum saeculi hujus contra spiritualia nequitiae in caelestibus."

This *vos* coming early in the verse is with *vg* some Latins and distinctly *boh* (Greek puts υμας after δυνασθαι where it is superfluous in Latin).

The order "flesh and blood" is also distinctly *boh* (against *sah*) as pointed out before.

"*Et* potestates" against *Gk* and *boh* is again *vg* with *sah* and *Orsiesius* $D^{gr}E^{gr}$ *f*.

Luke xxiii. 42. "memento (inquiens) mei Domine, cum veneris *in regnum tuum*" (repeated thus again in a second quotation).

Again *in regnum tuum* is *vg* with *c e ff*$_2$ *l Orig*$^{\text{int quater}}$ *Hil* and εις την βασιλειαν σου $B^{gr}L^{gr}$ against all remaining Greeks εν τη βασιλεια σου with *a b q Orig*$^{4,\,435,\,455}$ *syr arm aeth*; *boh* ϩⲉⲛ ⲧⲉⲕⲙⲉⲧⲟⲩⲣⲟ, *sah* ϩⲛ̄ ⲧⲉⲕⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲣⲟ.

Matt. xiii. 31/32 in full. The order (32) "quod omnium est seminum minimum" is not Latin, Greek, or Coptic order, bringing *minimum* last. *Hil* agrees.

Luke vii. 22, 23, in full.

Order *quae audivistis et vidistis* is unusual (not *sah boh*) witnessed to by *ff₂ gr* 69 and *Basil.*

Omit *surdi audiunt Isai Abb.* So only one *sah* MS. (114), and *syr pesh* (13), no Greeks or Latins.

Matt. xxvi. 39 } are thus combined: "Pater mi, si fieri potest,
Luke xxii. 42 } transeat a me calix iste *in hac hora.*"
Mark xiv. 35 }

We know at any rate that this quotation has not been spoiled by assimilation to the Vulgate. In Mark some Old Latins have *hora haec* (*d i q* with D$^{gr}$ η ωρα αυτη), *hora illa f, illa hora c ff₂* (*k* elides). So also *sah* ⲧⲉⲓⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩ, but *boh* ϯⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩ.

(Phil. iii. 10, 11, is free: "cognoscamus eum et virtutem resurrectionis ipsius et participes sumus passionem ejus, mortique conformemur, ut occurramus ad resurrectionem mortuorum.")

Heb. x. 34 also free: "rapinam bonorum nostrorum (ut Paullus ait) cum gaudio *suscipientes, quandoquidem* meliorem et manentem substantiam *habemus* in caelis."

"Suscipientes," "quandoquidem habemus," taking the place of προσεδεξασθε, and γινωσκοντες εχειν.

Matt. xxiv. 28 } "ubi corpus est illuc congregabuntur *et*
Luke xvii. 37 } aquilae."

We can draw no inference from this *vg* reading. In Luke some *boh* MSS. have the addition.

(Col. iii. 1/3 are turned into 1st person plural.)

Gal. vi. 5 is turned round and made to read:

"*onus enim fert quisque suum*"

which does not agree with Latin, Copt, or Greek, where εκαστος occupies the first place.

2 Cor. v. 10. "Omnes nos *sisti* ante tribunal Christi ut unusquisque recipiat ex operibus quae gessit in corpore suo vel *praemium* vel *supplicium.*"

*Sisti* appears new, and the end for ειτε αγαθον ειτε κακον (or φαυλον ℵC *Orig etc., Tisch. Treg. W-H*) or *sive bonum sive malum* is strange and bold, for one cannot well read "praemium vel supplicium" into

*boh:* ⲓⲧⲉ ⲡⲉⲑⲛⲁⲩⲉϥ ⲓⲧⲉ ⲡⲉⲧϩⲱⲟⲩ (*sah* wanting).

Matt. xiii. 47, 48, nearly in full. *Ex omni genere* PISCIUM is *vg* and Latin and *sah* against Gk and *boh* which do not supply *piscium.*

1 Tim. iv. 8. Corporis exercitatio *parum* utilis est. "parum" here for "modicum" seems new. *Isaiah* used it thus once before for ολιγον.

Luke x. 18, 19, nearly in full. *Isaiah* uses *dedi* for *do* with *vg* both *coptics* many O.L. and Gk ℵBC*LX. Here again it is hard to say if *vg* has been followed. He elides "et super omnem virtutem inimici," but so do some other Fathers when quoting this verse.

Luke xii. 32, 33. So again here "quia complacuit Patri vestro," for οτι ευδοκησεν ο πατηρ υμων is *vg*. He writes, however, "*et habebitis* sacculos . . ." for ποιησατε εαυτοις or *facite vobis* in verse 33, which seems new and free.

Luke xxii. 28/30 is regular. He uses *in mensa mea* (for επι της τραπεζης μου of Greek and *super mensam meam* of *latt*). *Boh* is ⲉⲓ ⲧⲁⲧⲣⲁⲡⲉⲍⲁ (some ⲉⲓⲭⲉⲛ with *sah*); ⲉⲓ is to be noted.

Gal. ii. 19, 20, is quite regular.

Gal. v. 24 is *vg*: "Qui Christi Jesu sunt (inquit) carnem crucifixerunt cum *vitiis* et concupiscentiis."

Other Latins say *passionibus* (παθημασι) for *vitiis*. *Cypr* also uses *vitiis* and *Aug* uses *perturbationibus* 1/2.

*Boh* with Gk ⲛⲉⲙ ⲡⲉⲥⲡⲁⲑⲟⲥ.

2 Tim. ii. 12, is regular.

1 Cor. ii. 9. "neque oculus vidit neque auris audivit *neque* cor hominis cogitatione comprehendit."

This third *neque* is *vg*, *Tert etc.*

*Boh* is divided, some ⲟⲩⲁⲉ some ⲟⲩⲟⲩⲟⲩ (*sah Balestri* has ⲛⲉⲧⲙ̄ throughout).

The Greeks all have και επι καρδιαν ανθρωπου ουκ ανεβη.

Phil. iv. 5/7 is practically regular.

In verse 7 he uses *superat* (υπερεχουσα) for *exsuperat* of *vg*.

*Boh* ⲉⲧⲃⲟⲟⲩ (*sah* ⲉⲧⲭⲟⲟⲥⲉ).

Matt. vi. 12, 14 (eliding 13 and running 14 immediately after 12) are regular except that *Isaiah* supplies *peccata vestra* at end of verse 14. Thus *boh* distinctly (all MSS.), but *sah* only partially (three out of five), with *vg* and some Old Latin.

John. i. 12, 13, in full, are quite regular.

Luke i. 35. "*Quia* spiritus sanctus superveniet in te et virtus altissimi obumbrabit tibi."

This introductory *quia* corresponds to the ⲭⲉ of *boh* and *sah*.

2 Cor. xiii. 5 is shortened: "Probate vosmet ipsos utrum Christus in vobis sit ne forte reprobi sitis" for: "εαυτους πειραζετε ει εστε εν τη πιστει εαυτους δοκιμαζετε. η ουκ επιγινωσκετε εαυτους οτι Ιησους Χριστος εν υμιν εστιν; ει μη τι αδοκιμοι εστε."

Later *Isaiah* gives this verse regular from η ουκ επιγινωσκετε onwards.

Eph. iii. 16/18. *Isaiah* has *habitare Christum in interiori homine per fidem in cordibus vestris*, running part of 16 and 17 together, as *boh*. He continues: *radicati et fundati in caritate* against the usual Gk (and Latin) order "εν αγαπη ερριζωμενοι και τεθεμελιωμενοι."

It is noteworthy that *boh* places εν αγαπη between the two verbs, thus: "being rooted *in love* being firmly founded," while *sah* brings εν αγαπη *last* with *Isaiah* against all Greeks and Latins.

2 Cor. iv. 7 is regular, followed (rough quotations from Col. iii. 15 and Rom. viii. 10 intervening) by 2 Cor. iv. 6 more freely: "Quoniam e tenebris lux effulsit in cordibus vestris cognitionis Dei."

Luke xii. 35 has *in manibus vestris* after *ardentes*, and continues "et eritis sicut *servi* exspectantes dominum suum donec revertatur a nuptis."

This *servi* for *hominibus* is not Greek or Latin nor *copt*, but is found in *Orsiesius*, "similes servorum."

(Eph. vi. 17 and 2 Cor. vii. 1 are combined.)

Rom. vi. 16 is regular. This is followed by

2 Cor. xiii. 5 regular, and not shortened as above.

Jas. i. 26 is regular, eliding εν υμιν, but omitting αλλ απατων καρδιαν αυτου.

1 Cor. ix. 24 follows, regular, το βραβειον being transliterated to *bravium* as *vg* other Latins and *Iren*$^{int}$. *Cypr* has *palmam*. *Hier contra Pelag*: *coronam*.

*Boh* ⲡⲓⲃⲁⲓ (*palmam*), *sah* ⲡⲉⲕⲗⲟⲙ (*coronam*), neither transliterating here.

[Note.—It would almost seem as if *Isaiah* had a concordance

in his hands. He follows quotation after quotation with verses beginning "*An nescitis*" (οὐκ οἴδατε). Of course the monks of the Thebaid were supposed to know the N.T. by heart (see Butler, *Lausiac History*, notes), and so apparently did those of Nitria, Sceti, and Cellia.]

1 Cor. ix. 25 follows, thus: "Qui enim (inquit) in agone contendit ab omnibus abstinet." This is the regular Latin form (for Gk: πας δε ο αγωνιζομενος παντα εγκρατευεται) but *qui* is substituted for *omnis*.

2 John ii. 15/17 in full is quite regular except that it follows the Latin "concupiscentia carnis *est* et concupiscentia oculorum," supplying "*est*" absent in *Gk* and *copt*.

2 John iii. 7, 8, follows, regular, but eliding καθως εκεινος δικαιος εστιν, and closing "Ab initio enim diabolus peccat" for "οτι απ αρχης ο διαβ. αμαρτανει" *Gk* and *copt* and other *latins*.

Jas. iv. 4. "Amicitia enim mundi inimicitia est in Deum." The *vg* is: *inimica est Dei* as *Gk* εχθρα του Θεου εστιν. ℵ = εχθρα εστιν τω Θεω as *Tisch*. *Boh* ⲟⲩⲙⲉⲧⲭⲁⲓ ⲧⲉ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉ ⲫ☥.

1 Peter ii. 11. "Hortor (inquit) vos fratres tamquam advenas et peregrinos ut abstineatis a carnalibus desideriis quae militant adversus animam."

αγαπητοι *init.* is superseded (without authority) by *vos fratres* following *hortor*.

"Ut abstineatis" is against *vg*, and *Gk* απεχεσθαι, but probably due to the translator of *Isaiah*.

John xiv. 30 is paraphrased: "Venit (inquiens) princeps hujus mundi et in me nihil *eorum quae ipsius sunt* invenit." The usual Latin is "et in me non habet quidquam" (Gk και εν εμοι ουκ εχει ουδεν). *d* says however: "et in me non habet nihil invenire" and *a* "et in me nihil habet invenire." *Cf.* Greek D and ΚΠ *etc.*

See the only Greek witness to agree with *Isaiah*, viz. *Ep'ph*$^{680}$ ουδεν των αυτου ευρισκει, to which *Tisch.* directs attention in connection with *Isaiah*.

1 John v. 19. "Mundus in maligno positus est" omits ολος without authority.

Luke vi. 27/30 is practically regular, except that *Isaiah* adds (without coptic support in Luke) Matt. v. 42 "*et volenti*

*mutuare a te ne avertare*" between "omni petenti te tribue" and "et ab eo qui aufert quae tua sunt ne repetas." (Cf. *Justin*$^{apol.}$)

John xv. 5, 4, is practically regular.

John xiv. 18. *Isaiah* adds *sed* before "et veniam vos." Not Gk Lat or copt, but *syr* S adds this.

John xii. 24 is regular.

John xii. 26 elides εμοι ακολουθειτω. So only *boh* $D_2$*.

Matt. xix. 27/29 in full are regular except for omission of *duodecim* in connection with *sedes* in verse 28. Not so *copt* or others.

Matt. viii. 21 } is most irregular: "(Ideo venienti ad se
Luke ix. 59 } dicentique) sequar te Domine sed permitte ut prius *disponam ea quae in domo mea sunt.*"

This comes from *Origen* $^{3, 683}$ ου μιμησαμενοι τον ειποντα· αλλα πρωτον επιτρεψον μοι εις τ. οικ. μου απελθειν και αποταξασθαι τοις εις τ. οικ. μου . . .

It is interesting as regards the range of *Isaiah's* reading.

Luke ix. 62. "aptus est *ad regnum* caelorum" (*vide supra*).

Luke xiv. 26 is regular. It closes *meus esse discipulus* with *vg.*

Matt. xxii. 11, 13, is rather free.

2 Tim. ii. 4, 5, are rather free "Nemo militans vitae negotiis implicatur ut ei placeat *a quo miles electus est.* Neque pugil quisquam coronatur nisi legitime certaverit."

Followed by:

2 Tim ii. 6 regular.

1 Cor. vii. 32, 33. "Qui sine uxore est (inquit) solicitus est quae Domini sunt quomodo placeat Deo; qui autem cum uxore est quae sunt mundi quomodo placeat uxori *et divisus est.*" (*Cf. Evagrius* and *boh.*)

1 Cor. xv. 50 is quite free: "qui turpiter flagitioseque vivunt (ut ait apostolus) regnum Dei possidere non possunt."

Gal. v. 22, 23. Thus: "Fructus (inquiens) spiritus est caritas, gaudium, pax, patientia, longanimitas, bonitas, benignitas, mansuetudo, fides, modestia, continentia, castitas. Adversus hujusmodi non est lex."

There is some amplification here. *Isaiah* is the first of the Egyptians examined to tamper with the accurate repetition of St. Paul's language here, unless his translator be responsible.

Matt. xxv. 11 is a little loose.

John xv. 5, 6, is rather in accord with the previous quotation, but fuller.

John xvii. 9 is regular.

John xvii. 15, 16, is free.

John xvii. 20, 21, opens regular, and closes free: "sicut et nos unum sumus," against καθως συ πατερ εν εμοι καγω εν σοι.

John xvii. 24 regular.

1 John iii. 2 regular.

1 John ii. 3 free.

1 John iii. 13, 14, pretty regular except for the use of *carissimi* here for αδελφοι μου, just as above (1 Pet. ii. 11) *Isaiah* inversely used *vos fratres* for αγαπητοι.

1 John iii. 10 regular.

1 John ii. 29. *ex Deo* for εξ αυτου is free.

1 John iii. 8 regular.

1 John iii. 9 quite regular.

2 Pet. i. 5/9. This long quotation is quite regular until the end, where we omit του καθαρισμου with $K^{boh}$ *alone.*

Luke iii. 8/9, omitting και μη αρξησθε to end of verse 8, is regular.

Matt. xii. 33 regular.

Matt. vii. 16, 21, regular.

Jas. ii, 20, 19, 26, are regular.

Eph. v. 3/5 in full, quite regular.

Eph. v. 6/11 is regular. Note ver. 9 "Fructus enim *lucis*" (against *textus receptus* του πνευματος) with most authorities, including *copt.*

Eph. iv. 31 regular.

1 Cor. xi. 1 regular.

Gal. iii. 27 regular.

Matt. vii. 7. Thus: "Petite et *accipietis* (*Gr omnes* δοθησεται υμιν) quaerite et invenietis pulsate et aperietur vobis." This *accipietis* is with *Aug* against *dabitur vobis* of the rest, and against *Gr* and *copt.*

Luke xi. 5/8 is condensed: "(Qui media nocte ad amicum suum accessit) *Mutua* (inquit) mihi tres panes quoniam amicus ad me venit de via. Cum igitur pulsare pergeret quod petebat impetravit."

This *mutua*, however, is quite remarkable (other *Latt* "com-

moda") for it agrees with both coptics (*boh* ⲉⲡⲟⲩⲱⲁⲡ, *sah* ⲉⲡⲉⲩⲱⲁⲡ) rather than with *Gr* χρῆσον or *lat.* commoda.

Luke xv. 7 supplies *Amen* at the beginning; and elides οὕτω, the latter apparently with *boh.*

Luke xviii. 22
Matt. xix. 21
Mark x. 21
} *Isaiah* supplies *et tolle crucem suam* not present in Greek.

In Matt. *syr cu* adds it (with *Athan*).

In Mark many Greeks add with some *boh* and the two *sah* MSS. which are extant here.

1 Cor. xiii. 1, 3/5, regular. The translator uses *non indecore se gerit* for ουκ ασχημονει. We omit η αγαπη before ου ζηλοι and before ου περπερευεται.

Acts xxi. 13 elides εις Ιερουσαλημ ετοιμως εχω with nine greek cursives *Bas Thdt Aug.*

John xiv. 2. "Multae (enim) sunt (inquit) mansiones apud Patrem meum." See remarks elsewhere on this (p. 143), against Greek order.

1 Cor. xv. 41 is condensed "alia sit solis gloria, alia lunae (– και αλλη δοξα αστερων) et stella a stella differat in claritate."

Col. ii. 11, 12, omits των αμαρτιων with half the Greeks, *it vg boh etc.*

Adds *sed* before "in circumcisione Christi" with *vg Cypr Hil* without *Gk* or *coptic* authority.

Eph. iv. 22/24. Regular, but for *spiritum mentis* against Latin *spiritu* and Greek τω πνευματι του νοος, and *boh* ϩⲉⲛ ⲡⲓⲡⲛⲁ ⲛ̅ⲧⲉ ⲡⲉⲧⲉⲛϩⲏⲧ, also *sah.*

And *fin.*: in justitia et sanctitate *et veritate* (for εν δικ. και οσιοτητι της αληθειας). Some O.L. read thus and *Cypr* [not *vg* nor *boh* nor *sah*].

1 Pet. ii. 24. "ut *moriamini* quidem peccato vivatis autem justitiae."

The *vg* says *mortui*, but other Latins *separati* (*Gr. omn.* απογενομενοι). *Boh* agrees with *Isaiah* using the usual word for *dead.*

John. xix. 28/30 are condensed, which leads him to say "(quo degustato dixit) Consummata *sunt omnia*," supplying *omnia* erroneously in verse 30 from verse 28.

Heb. iv. 10. He elides και before κατεπαυσεν, having "ab

omnibus operibus suis quievit." Not so Latins or Greeks. So does *boh*, writing "For he who came into his rest, himself also rested from his works."

Eph. ii. 14, 16, is loose, and the translator uses *inimicitias* for *την εχθραν*, as *vg* and some Latins.

Rom. xi. 25. Thus freely: "Caecitas enim (inquit apostolus) contigit ex parte populo Israel donec *omnes ingrediantur nationes*" (for *οὗ το πληρωμα των εθνων εισελθη* and *donec plenitudo Gentium intraret*).

Gal. vi. 16 is free, eliding *και ελεος* without authority.

Rom. ii. 28, 29. Thus: "Nam (ut idem ait apostolus) non qui in manifesto Judaeus est in carne, ille Judaeus est, neque circumcisio quae cernitur illa est circumcisio; sed qui in occulto Judaeus est et circumcisio cordis in spiritu non *in* littera."

It will be seen that two clauses are boiled together, bringing *in carne* too early without authority.

As regards *in littera* at the close (not Greek = *γραμματι* only, nor Latin = *littera* only) note *boh* distinctly ϩⲉⲛ ⲟⲩⲥϩⲁⲓ ⲁⲛ.

2 Cor. v. 1 seems a little corrupt, thus: "Et si terrena nostra habitatio hujus tabernaculi dissolvatur scimus nos (bringing *οιδαμεν init.* very late) habitationem habere (for *εχομεν*) domum non manufactam, in caelis (– *αιωνιον*)."

This treatment and omission of *αιωνιον* are not authorized.

Tit. i. 2. "Deus qui non mentitur" (*Gr ὁ αψευδης Θεος*) *Vg* "qui non mentitur Deus" against more elegant "non mendax Deus" *etc.* of others. *Boh* follows the Greek.

Rom. vi. 9. Thus: "Christus enim mortuus est et resurrexit et amplius non moritur; mors illi ultra non dominabitur."

The *mortuus est* is superfluous as regards Rom. vi. 9, being brought in from the seventh verse "*ο γαρ αποθανων*."

Luke x. 4, 5, is loose.

1 Cor. xiii. 8, 7, is rough: "Caritas vero numquam excidit sed omnia sperat et credit et sustinet." It is only noteworthy because the order *sperat, credit* (against *Gr παντα πιστευει παντα ελπιζει*) has the support of another Egyptian, viz. *Mark the monk*. Thus we connect the very language of the monks of the day; for committing so much to memory, they spoke in Scriptural sentences, and when a

well-known verse was habitually repeated in wrong order it became stereotyped or linguityped.

Matt. xi. 29, 30, now in full, only lightly referred to before, is regular, eliding the final *est* with *vg.* (*Boh* elides *est* in both places, while the Greek final εστιν has to do service for both clauses.)

Luke xvii. 10. Thus: "Cum feceritis omnia *quae praecipio vobis* (for παντα τα διαταχθεντα υμιν and *quae praecepta sunt vobis*) dicite servi inutiles sumus: etenim quod debemus facere fecimus."

*Copt* (with ℵ$^{c}$AB *etc.*) is: "all things which they commanded."

D$^{gr}$ *d* are the only ones (with *Ambrst* + vobis) who say οσα λεγω, but *l* agrees with *Isaiah* saying *quae mando vobis.*

1 Cor. xi. 3. Briefly referring "nam (ut ait apostolus) caput mulieris est vir" he passes to:

1 Cor. xi. 7/12 in full, thus: (7) "Vir (inquit) non debet velare caput: imago enim et gloria Dei est: mulier autem est viri gloria. (8) Non enim est vir ex muliere sed mulier ex viro. (9) Etenim non est creatus vir propter mulierem sed mulier propter virum. (10) Propterea mulier debet velare caput et propter angelos. (11) Verumtamen neque mulier sine viro neque vir sine muliere in Domino. (12) Sicut enim mulier ex viro sic et vir ex muliere omnia autem ex Deo."

The most important thing here is in verse 10, where the Greek runs: δια τουτο οφειλει η γυνη εξουσιαν εχειν επι της κεφαλης δια τους αγγελους, and the *sah*: ⲉⲧⲃⲉ ⲡⲁⲓ ⲱⲃⲉ ⲉⲧⲉ ⲥⲃⲓⲙⲉ ⲉⲕⲱ ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲉⲝⲟⲩⲥⲓⲁ ⲉⲝⲛ̄ ⲧⲉⲥⲁⲡⲉ | ⲉⲧⲃⲉ ⲁⲅⲅⲉⲗⲟⲥ, but *boh* (five MSS.):

ⲉⲑⲃⲉ ⲫⲁⲓ ⲥⲉⲙⲡⲱⲁ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉ ⲧⲥⲃⲓⲙⲓ ⲭⲁ ⲟⲩⲉⲣⲡⲱⲙ ⲉⲭⲉⲛ ⲧⲉⲥⲁⲫⲉ ⲉⲑⲃⲉ ⲛⲓⲁⲅⲅⲉⲗⲟⲥ

agreeing with *Isaiah* except for the "*et*" before "propter angelos" (which *Bede* has from the commentaries on this passage). I think this is very important, for εξουσιαν is witnessed to by most with *Tert*†; *Iren*, however (*gr lat*), uses καλυμμα, *velamen*, as *Hier* (*Ezech.*) *Bede Aug harl***, while *Origen* of course conflates *velamen*

† *Tert* (*Marc* and also *De vel. virg.*).

*et potestatem* [*see Tisch. ad loc.* who does not quote the *coptic* here]. *Vg* and Latins have *potestatem.* While *boh* five MSS. have ⲟⲩⲉⲣⲭⲱⲛ, the others have ⲟⲩⲉⲣⲭⲓⲱⲓ. I do not go into other minutiae in this passage which the translator of *Isaiah* may have dealt with liberally. But he could not obscure the issue in verse 10. In verse 7 we may note *imago enim et gloria Dei est.*

*Boh:* ⲭⲉ ⲟⲩϩⲓⲕⲱⲛ ⲛⲉⲙ ⲟⲩⲱⲟⲩ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉ ⲫϯ ⲡⲉ

while *Gk* is εικων και δοξα Θεου υπαρχων

and *sah* ⲉⲧϩⲉⲓⲕⲱⲛ ⲡⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲡⲉⲟⲟⲩ ⲙ̄ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ.

After 2 Cor. vi. 16 comes a free reference to Matt. xviii. 19 and elsewhere:

"Si duo vestrum consenserint quaecumque in nomine meo petierint impetrabunt"

and another to John xv. 4 and elsewhere:

"manete (inquit) in me et ego in vobis"

and yet another to Rom. vi. 4, 6, and elsewhere:

"Illi enim consepulti sumus in mortem (ut inquit apostolus) ut destruat corpus peccati (hoc est) ut peccato amplius non serviamus."

Follows Rom. viii. 10 thus: "(Quamobrem) si in te Christus habitat [*pro* ει δε Χριστος εν υμιν] peccatum mortuum est [*pro* το μεν σωμα νεκρον δι' αμαρτιαν] spiritus autem per justitam vivit [*pro* το δε πνευμα ζωη δια δικαιοσυνην; *boh* ⲡⲓⲡⲛ̄ⲁ̄ ⲁⲉ ⲟⲩⲱⲛϥ ⲡⲉ (ⲡⲉ ⲡⲱⲛϩ *sah*) ⲉⲃⲏⲉ ⲧⲙⲉⲑⲙⲏⲓ (ⲉⲧⲃⲉ ⲧⲁⲓⲕⲁⲓⲟⲥⲩⲛⲏ *sah*)].

This therefore is only a little loose, while the last clause agrees in principle with *vg* (*Clem*) [not *am fu harl**] and *f g* with Greek FG ζη and *arm* (ζων *lect.* 14).

Rom. vii. 2/3. Thus: "Quae enim (ut ait apostolus) sub viro est mulier, ei dum vivit alligata est lege. Quod si vir mortuus fuerit liberabitur *a lege* viri. (3) Itaque si vivente viro cum alio fuerit adultera declarabitur: at mortuo viro liberabitur a lege ut non sit adultera si fuerit cum alio viro."

There is nothing particular to comment upon here. The *si fuerit* at the end while agreeing with *copt* (Gr γενομενην simply) is also a Latin and Vulgate reading.

1 Cor. vi. 16, 17. Thus: "Qui adhaeret meretrici (inquit apostolus) unum cum illa corpus efficitur. Et qui adhaeret Domino unus cum illo spiritus est."

*Efficitur* is *vg* (and *Aug*), but *unum cum illa* and *unus cum illo* is not. (*Sah* is wanting and *boh* hardly lends itself to this, ⲟⲩⲥⲱⲙⲁ ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲱⲧ ⲡⲉ . . . ⲟⲩⲡⲛ̄ⲁ ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲱⲧ.) *Syr* however is thus arranged.

Matt. xviii. 3 and 1 Pet. ii. 2 are regular (as 1 Pet. ii. 1/2 later in full).

(Eph. iv. 14, 15, in full, agrees with *vg* including *in illo per omnia* (*Gr* εις αυτον τα παντα) while *boh* is "in all things into him," but *sah*: ⲉϩⲟⲩⲛ ⲉⲣⲟϥ ⲙ̄ⲡⲧⲏⲣϥ̄.)

1 Cor. iii. 1/2/3 is regular.

Gal. iv. 1/3 is to all intents regular, and 2 Tim. ii 22, as also 1 Cor. xiv. 20, and Heb. vi. 13, 14, although the latter closes briefly "*Nisi benedicens benedicam.*"

Luke xxiv. 41. "Habetis (inquiens) aliquid quod manducetur." He elides ενθαδε. Both coptics supply ⲙ̄ⲡⲁⲓⲙⲁ. Observe ⲛ^greek* ⲱⲇⲉ.

In Heb. ii. 14, 15, the order *carni et sanguini* is maintained with one *boh* MS. (O) [*sah Balestri* missing] and only Greek KL *min* with *aeth vg f demid tol syr*^sch but a good many Fathers. We cannot tell what *Isaiah* wrote, as the translator may have used the *vg* order. [ⲥⲛⲟϥ ϩⲓ ⲥⲁⲣⲝ *sah* teste Horner.]

Eph. iv. 13 elides και της επιγνωσεως without authority. This quotation occurs very often among the Egyptian monks, given in part, rarely in full.

Eph. iv. 16 (latter part of the verse) regular.

1 John ii. 14 is irregular. He says "*Haec* scribo (inquiens) vobis *filioli* (for πατερες) quia cognovistis eum qui est ab initio. Scripsi vobis adolescentes quia vicistis malum." By using two clauses out of three he confuses the first two. *Malum* at the end for τον πονηρον is very loose. Even the *vg* has *malignum*. Probably the translator is responsible for this. *Boh* is distinct ⲉⲡⲓⲡⲟⲛⲏⲣⲟⲥ, *sah* ⲉⲡⲡⲟⲛⲏⲣⲟⲥ.

1 Thess. v. 5, 7, 2, 3, he welds into one. "Non sumus (inquiens) noctis nec tenebrarum. (Eos vero qui desidiae dediti se ipsos negligunt coarguit) qui dormiunt [*pro* οι γαρ καθευδοντες] (inquiens) nocte dormiunt et qui ebrii sunt [*pro* και οι μεθυσκομενοι] nocte sunt ebrii. (Et rursum) Dies Domini tamquam fur veniet [– εν νυκτι

ουτως] et non effugient [– οταν γαρ *ad* εν γαστρι εχουση]." Continuing :

1 Thess. v. 8. "*Induentes*" *etc.* regular.

John. xiii. 35 is repeated without παντες, and thus : "In hoc enim (inquit) cognoscent vos meos esse discipulos si *dilexeritis* [αγαπην εχητε] inter vos." (See *ante*.)

*Cf. boh* ⲉϣⲱⲡ ⲁⲣⲉⲧⲉⲛϣⲁⲛⲙⲉⲛⲣⲉ

and *sah* ⲉⲧⲉⲧⲛ̄ϣⲁⲛⲙⲉⲣⲉ

and *gr* 69–124 *Evst* 222 αγαπατε.

After a long series of O.T. quotations we run into :

Gal. v. 9. "Modicum (inquit) fermentum totam massam *corrumpit*" [for Μικρα ζυμη ολον το φυραμα ζυμοι]. This is the reading of *vg* and the Latins with *Lucifer* ; not *boh*, nor *Hier* = "fermentat" and *Sedul*, who says "non ut male in Latinis codicibus *corrumpit*." *Epiph* wavers : "ζυμοι" εποιησε "δολοι" as D* *Const* with δολοι, and *Basil* wavers with ζυμοι several times, δολωση once.

Matt. vi. 14, 15. In verse 14 *fin.* "peccata vestra" is supplied [*vide supra*], but verse 15 is shortened : "Quod si non dimiseritis nec Pater vester dimittet vobis."

Gal. vi. 1 regular.

James v. 19, 20, in full, supplies *mei* after *Fratres* at the opening with the *Latins*, *Greek* ℵABKP [against L *min. Did Oec text. recept.*] and *copt.*

Matt. xviii. 32/35. Thus : "Serve nequam, omne debitum (– εκεινην) dimisi tibi quoniam rogasti me ; nonne oportuit et te misereri conservi tui (– ως και εγω σε ελεησα). Et iratus (– ο κυριος αυτου) tradidit eum tortoribus donec redderet omne debitum (– αυτω). Sic faciet Pater meus caelestis (– υμιν) nisi dimiseritis unusquisque fratri suo e cordibus vestris (– τα παραπτωματα αυτων)."

Above is partially with *copt* as may be seen.

Matt. vii. 14, 13, more fully this time : (14) "Angusta enim est porta et arcta est via quae ducit ad vitam et pauci inveniunt eam. (13) Lata autem et spatiosa est via quae ducit ad perditionem et multi sunt qui ingredientur per illam."

The order is reversed. This is natural from mental treatment,

for verse 13 opens: εισελθητε δια της στενης πυλης, continuing with the *broad* way, instead of the narrow way.

Matt. vii. 15, 16, follow, regular.

Rom. viii. 35, 38, 39, follow. In 35 the order is wrong. He writes "Quis (inquit apostolus) nos separabit a caritate Christi? Tribulatio an angustia an fames (– η διωγμος) an periculum an nuditas (*pro* η γυμνοτης η κινδυνος) an gladius."

This is free and not the order of *boh* or *sah*; nor do they omit *persecutio*, but the Vulgate does and also *Tertullian* and *Epiphan* [not *Cypr* nor *Lucifer* nor *Hier* (*Eph.*) nor *Fulg* (but out of order)].

*Isaiah* continues verse 38 in close connection without break:

"Certus sum enim quod neque mors neque vita neque angeli neque principatus (– ουτε δυναμεις) neque praesentia neque futura (– ουτε υψωμα ουτε βαθος) neque ulla alia creatura poterit nos separare a caritate Christi [*pro* του Θεου της εν Χριστω Ιησου τω Κυριω (*vel* του Κυριου) ημων].

As regards omission of ουτε δυναμεις its position is doubtful, most Greeks transferring later. *Boh* MSS. L and O write ⲟⲩⲁⲉ ⲉⲝⲟⲩⲥⲓⲁ after ⲁⲣⲭⲏ but the rest add ⲟⲩⲁⲉ ⲭⲟⲩⲱ at end of verse. (*Sah* Balestri is mutilated, but Horner can complete, reading with majority of *boh.*) Greek 116 omits outright with *Isaiah.*

In ver. 39 the omission of ουτε υψωμα ουτε βαθος is gratuitous. *Hier* 1/3 does it (*Eph.*) but apparently no one else dared to use freedom here.

John iii. 14 is regular.

1 Cor. x. 9 is loose: "Et ne tentemus (inquit) eum [*pro* μηδε εκπειραζωμεν τον Χριστον (*vel* Κυριον)] sicut illi [*pro* καθως (και) τινες αυτων] tentaverunt et a serpentibus sunt interfecti."

Matt. xxii. 35/40. "Accessit (inquit) ad eum unus e legisperitis tentans eum et dicens [– και λεγων ℵBL *e ff*$_{1}$ *g*$_{1,2}$ *l q vg sah copt syr*$^{sch}$ *aeth Orig*$^{int}$] (36) Magister quod est *magnum et primum* (*pro* μεγαλη) mandatum in lege. (37) Cui respondit Jesus (*pro* ο δε Ιησους ειπεν αυτω) Diliges Dominum Deum tuum ex toto corde tuo (– και) ex tota anima tua (– και εν ολη τη διανοια σου) [*om. ver.* 38; *om.* αγαπησεις] (39) et proximum tuum sicut te ipsum.

(40) In his duobus praeceptis universa lex pendet et prophetae" [*pro* ολος ο νομος και οι προφηται κρεμανται, *sed* κρεμαται και οι προφηται *Lach. Treg. Tisch. W-H. Rev. cum graec.* ℵBDLZ 33 *it vg syr aeth Bas Orig Tert, contra* (*sah*) *boh et Gr rell.*].

Thus *Isaiah* opposes *copt* pretty well all through, except in verse 38, where *boh* gives "great and first" as we do in verse 36. But *copt* has verse 38.

But it is all very free as is seen from "*Cui respondit Jesus.*"

1 Cor. xv. 49. "Sicut portavimus imaginem terreni (inquit apostolus) portemus et imaginem caelestis."

*Portemus* is the reading of practically all *Latins, copt* and most *Greeks.* ($B^{gr}$ here goes with *text. recept.* φορεσομεν.)

*Isaiah* repeats this with *portemus* again on the next page.

2 Cor. iii. 18 in full: "Nos omnes revelata facie gloriam Dei (*pro* Κυριου) veluti speculo referentes IN eamdem imaginem (*cum copt pro* την αυτην εικονα) transformamur de claritate in claritatem tamquam a Domini spiritu."

While the *Dei* (unauthorized) appears to be a slip, *Isaiah* agrees against Greek with *boh* (*sah* Balestri not extant) in writing "IN eamdem imaginem," ϩⲉⲛ ⲧⲁⲓϩⲓⲕⲱⲛ (ⲧⲁⲓϩⲓⲕⲱⲛ) as *Macarius* (*vide supra*) and *Tich. Aug. Jerome* others and the *vg.*

1 Cor. xiii. 12. *Isaiah* supplies a verb, writing: "Nunc autem videmus per speculum in aenigmate tunc *videbimus ipsum* facie ad faciem."

This is most distinctly *bohairic* (all MSS.) against *sah* and against all Latins and all Greeks (τοτε δε προσωπον προς προσωπον).

John xv. 14/15. "(nosque sibi) *fratres et amicos* (adscribens)" is a little loose if it refers to John xv. 14/15 where φιλοι is used, but *Isaiah* had in mind no doubt John xx. 17 "πορευου δε προς τους αδελφους μου και ειπε αυτοις . . ." for he follows with:

John xx. 17. "Ascendo (inquit) ad Patrem meum et Patrem vestrum Deum meum et Deum vestrum."

John xvii. 24, 23, is free and inverted:

"Volo pater ut ubi ego sum et ipsi illic sint mecum. Quoniam dilexisti eos sicut tu dilexisti me."

*Boh* is confused here, see Horner's note. Three *boh* MSS. omit the "loving" clause altogether in verse 23. (See *post.*)

John xv. 19 he inverts also: "Elegi (inquit) eos de mundo propterea odit eos mundus quoniam ab eo non sunt."

Eph. v. 31, 32, is interesting because unlike the rest he runs on into verse 32:

"Propter hoc (inquit apostolus) relinquet homo patrem (— αυτου) et matrem et adhaerebit uxori suae (*non* προς την γυναικα αυτου *sed* τη γυναικι αυτου *cum* ℵ*AD*FG *boh et sah* ⲉⲧⲉϥⲥⲱⲙⲉ *Mcion Meth*) et erunt duo in carne una: sacramentum hoc magnum est: Ego autem dico *in Christo et in Ecclesia*" (*pro* εις Χριστον και εις την εκκλησιαν).

The latter is with *vg f g*, but *boh* is ⲉⲡ$\overline{\text{ⲭⲥ}}$ ⲙⲉⲙ ⲧⲉⲕⲕⲗⲏⲥⲓⲁ as also *sah.*

Thus here we go against *copt* if we can rely on the translator of *Isaiah.*

Eph. iii. 6. Thus: "(Idem apostolus) gentes (dixit esse) coheredes et concorporales et comparticipes promissionis (— ejus *vg*) in Christo *Jesu* per Evangelium."

BOTH *boh* and *sah* have *Jesus* with Greek ℵABCP.

Matt. x. 20 regular.

1 Cor. ii. 10, 16, regular. He merely passes from 10 to 16: "nos enim (inquit) mentem Christi habemus."

Rom. xii. 5. "Unum corpus sumus omnes in Christo: singuli autem alter alterius membra."

This *alter alterius* is Latin (Gk is ο δε καθεις αλληλων), but corresponds also to the coptic method ⲡⲓⲟⲩⲁⲓ ⲡⲓⲟⲩⲁⲓ as elsewhere.

Eph. v. 30. "Quoniam (inquit) membra sumus corporis ejus ex *carnibus* (*pro* της σαρκος) ejus et ex ossibus ejus."

This has no support except *Iren* (commenting). The others all in the singular. But both *boh* and *sah* deviate seriously here, for, with Gk ℵ*AB 17 67** *aeth Method Euthal* they omit εκ της σαρκος αυτου και εκ των οστεων αυτου altogether.

John xiv. 15/17. This is condensed thus: "Si me diligitis (inquit Dominus) mandata mea servate. Et ego rogabo Patrem et mittet (*pro* δωσει) vobis paracletum (— αλλον, *et* — ινα μενη μεθ' υμων εις τον αιωνα) spiritum veritatis."

It is quite noteworthy that $A^{boh}$ (and Horner's text) also omit αλλον in verse 16, but no Greeks and no Latins. The only other support is one syriac MS.

Here I think we see the translator at work without being able to injure the text. For he writes *mittet* for δωσει against Greek and both coptics. Now some Latins (but not *vg*) have *mittet* instead of *dabit* (as *Tertull*). But the omission of *alium* is probably basic, although only supported by one *boh* MS.

2 Cor. xiii. 5. "Nonne (inquit) cognoscitis quod Christus Jesus *habitat in vobis*? Nisi forte reprobi estis."
Greek is "εν υμιν εστιν" (some omit εστιν).

We have already seen from *Mark the monk's* Greek testimony twice over: { οικει εν υμιν (Galland.$^{8, 22}$), οικει εν ημιν (Galland.$^{8, 41}$), that coptic lends itself to this (against Latin).

The next references are only general, embracing Matt. xv. 1–12, xiii. 47, 25–30, John xv. 6, Matt. xxv. 33, xiii. 3–8, xxv. 21, 23, xxii. 11–13.

The last is followed by a quotation:

Matt. xxii. 14. "*Quoniam* multi sunt vocati pauci vero electi."

This *quoniam* appears almost superfluous here in the context, but as it replaces γαρ of *gk* and *copt* it may be regarded as intentional. Curiously enough neither coptic version has any introductory ⲭⲉ here which might have given rise to it.

After Old Testament quotations, the next is:

1 Cor. xv. 50. "Caro enim et sanguis (ut ait apostolus) regnum Dei possidere non possunt" is regular with Greek. (Repeated shortly after as "caro et sanguis regnum Dei non *possidebunt* = *boh* and *gk* FG 42 *f g Tert Macar*).

1 Cor. iii. 3. Omit και διχοστασιαι with *copt* and *gk* ℵABCP a few cursives *vg arm aeth* and *Clem Orig*.

The next reference is given as of 1 Pet. ii. 11 "Seque nobis exemplum (proposuisse) ut sequamur vestigia ejus," but it is perhaps a reference to 2 Thess. iii. 7/9; it certainly has nothing to do with 1 Pet. ii. 11.

Phil. ii. 7 partially only: "Formam (enim) servi accipiens (vehementer atque incredibili modo) humiliavit semet ipsum" is quite regular.

2 Cor. v. 15 is quite free.

Acts xiv. 22. This reference is somewhat amplified, reading:

"per multas afflictiones *et aerumnas ingrediamur* in regnum caelorum."

*Gk* is: οτι δια πολλων θλιψεων δει ημας εισελθειν εις την βασιλειαν του Θεου.

*Copt* and *Latt* follow the Greek closely.

Matt. xxv. 21 (or 23) is regular but for + *quia* before "super paucas." This is not Greek but *Latin* and *vg* (*Iren*$^{int}$ *Orig*$^{int}$) but also *both coptics* very definitely ⲉⲡⲓⲁⲏ, as pointed out before.

Rom. viii. 13. "Si secundum carnem vixeritis moriemini" is regular.

*Gk* ει γαρ κατα σαρκα ζητε μελλετε αποθνησκειν.

1 Cor. x. 21. Thus: "Non potestis (inquit) mensae Dei participes esse et mensae daemoniorum" regular, but only giving the latter half of the verse.

Rom. xii. 17 regular.

John xvii. 24, 23. This is a variation on the previous quotation (*vide supra*) but is also inverted:

"Ubi ego sum volo ut et ipsi sint quoniam dilexi eos quemadmodum dilexisti me Pater. Et tu in me et ego in eis."

The last clause (inverted) belongs to the *beginning* of verse 23.

1 Cor. xv. 50. We now get the last clause of this passage (missing above where the first part of the verse was twice quoted) as follows: "corruptio incorruptionem non possidebit."

The *Gk* is: "ουδε η φθορα την αφθαρσιαν κληρονομεῖ" (but κληρονομησει C*D*FG *d e f g vg syr copt Meth Orig*$^{int}$ 2/3 *al.*).

Follows a curious reference to Matt. viii. 20:

"Vae nobis quia filius hominis qui est ejusdem essentiae cum Deo et Patre, pro nobis factus homo *non habet apud nos ubi caput reclinet*: cum vulpes hoc est astuti atque improbi spiritus suas *foveas* in nobis struxerint." (The text may be corrupt.)

Matt. vii. 3. The βλεπεις . . . κατανοεις of Greek and coptic is lost in Latin, which has *vides* twice.

*Isai* gives us a pretty turn here, writing "Vae vobis qui trabem habentes in oculo quam minimas fratrum festucas *acute cernimus*,"

so that he was following *Greek* or *coptic* or both. The coptics vary, and *boh* is nearest the Greek.

1 Cor. xi. 27 and 29 he mixes thus:

"Qui manducat panem (verse 27 + τουτον some and *copt*) et bibit (so *Gk* ver. 29; ver. 27 ἢ πινῃ most) calicem Domini indigne [– the rest of 27 and 28] judicium sibi manducat et bibit non dijudicans corpus Domini."

2 Cor. v. 10 puts the verb last against *Gk* and *copt*:

"Ut unusquisque nostrum in suo corpore accipiat."

This ends the main work.

In *Cap. de religiosa exercitu et quiete* we find:

a free reference to Matt. xxiv. 43/44 and Luke xii. 39.

Then:

Luke xxi. 34 thus: "Videte ne graventur corda vestra *crapulis et ebrietatibus* et curis saecularibus: et superveniet vobis repente hora."

This seems to me an important place, for the Greeks and Latins all have this in the singular "εν κραιπαλη και μεθη" "in crapula et ebrietate," while *boh* seems to agree with *Isaiah.*

*Boh* says ϩⲉⲛ ϩⲁⲛⲥⲓⲱⲉ ⲛⲉⲱ ϩⲁⲛⲑⲓϩⲓ translated by Horner "in surfeitings and drunkenness (*plur.*)" *sic.*

*Sah* is very different, emphasizing ⲟⲩ both times: ϩⲛ̄ ⲟⲩⲥⲓ ⲱⲛ̄ ⲟⲩⲧϩⲉ.

As regards *boh*, two MSS. seem to read ϩⲁⲛⲥⲓⲱⲉ (or ϩⲁⲛⲥⲓⲱⲏ) ⲟⲩⲑⲓϩⲓ, and others ⲟⲩ twice, but it must be clearly from the *boh* plural (of some MSS.) that *Isaiah* imbibed this. *a* apparently alone of latins has "gratulatione et *ebrietatibus.*" (In such places the interrelation of the Versions and the individual MSS. of each may be closely watched with a view to purposes of dating. This Vercelli MS. "*a*" of the Latin Version is one of the deepest interest. Revised, as it has been, before it was recopied as it stands now, it contains exceedingly ancient elements antedating this revision, and antedating the IV^th^ century.)

At the end *hora* is free and apparently unsupported (*vg* "dies illa" as *Gk* and *copt*).

Matt. vii. 14 is regular (not quoting 13 as above).

THE END.

# ROUGH INDEX.


א *saepe*
אA 8/9 *etc*
A$^{gr}$ *saepe*
Aethiopic 20 25 40 66 119 135 144 146 150 153 154 156 161 162 166 170 172 173 185 187 189 190 *etc*
Athanasius 14 *note* 150 159 181
Authorized version 171 *etc*

B$^{gr}$ (*Evang. etc*) 14 *note* 143 144 149 156 157 161 163 164 166 173 174 176 187 188 189 *etc*
B$^{gr}$ (*Apoc.*) *saepe*
Balestri 2 4 18 19 27 28 41 77 79 80 121 129 138 145 146 148 150 151 154 156 161 164 165 166 187
"Bashmuric": see "Middle Egyptian"
Belsheim 70 109
*Boh* and *sah*, relations between 3 21 23 42 54 118 145 *etc*
Bohairic, date of 117 *seq etc*
Buchanan, E. S. 49
Butler, Dom 117 *seq* 138 162 166 178

C$^{gr}$ 42 99 103 119 144 *etc*
Chase, Rt. Rev. F. H. 11 *note*
Clement$^{rom}$ 122 125 146 *etc*
Conflations vi 4 19 31 46 53 55 60 78 91 93 94 153 183/184
Confusion 5 9 32 35 39 41 44 47/48 49/50 52 56 57 59 63 74 75 79 80 81 87 89 90/91 95 149 160 163 189
"*Copt*," definition of, as employed here 2
Cyprian *saepe*

D$^{gr}$ 119 133 137 141 142 144 147 161 167 170 172 174 175 178 183 186 188 189 191 *etc*
Delitzsch 88

Error oculi 4 9 25 28 32 35 39 46 54 56 57 65 74 82 89 90/91 133 144 153 161 163 165
Eustathius 111 118 119
Evagrius 120 166/169 179
Evan. 28 111

F$^{gr}$ 125 131 137 147 151 155 156 162 167 170 172 184 189 190 191
Freer MS. 111 120 163

G$^{gr}$ 125 131 137 147 151 155 156 162 167 170 172 184 189 190 191
Gigas 97 *seq et saepe*
Goussen 2 4 5 7 15 17 18 19 27 28 29 41 45 66 69 72 77 78 79 80 82 95
Graeco-Syriac 104/105 *etc*
Greek cursives 1/3 14 26 52 56 64 70/71 97 100 and *note* 101 102 103 *etc* and see Handlist
Ditto, specimen pages of collations 112/116
Guidi 117
Gwynn, Dean vi 65 74 82 91 97 *seq*

Harnack 14 *note*
Hippolytus *saepe*
Homoioteleuton 7 27 40 44 57 68 102 112 150

Horner, Rev. George vi vii 1 3 *note* 7 10 15 17 20 26 27 28 30 31 32 34 36 37 40 43 46 48 51 52 54 56 58 62 64 68 69 72 75 76 77 88 96 121 125 129 138 145 146 148 149 151 155 156 160 161 162 163 164 165 166 167 173 185 187 189 190

Inscription 14
Irenaeus *saepe* 143 153 160 183 189 *etc*
Iren$^{int}$ 131 144 151 177 191 *etc*
Isaiah Abbot 120 131 132 149 153 167 171 172 173/192
Itacism 29 49 55 80

Jerome, St. 43 79 97 131 139 143 168 171 172 177 186 187 188 *etc*
Justin 122 144 146 179

K$^{gr}$ 147 150 151 178 185
Karlsson 70

L$^{gr}$ 130 135 143 144 151 160 163 164 174 176 185 186 187 188 *etc*
Lake, K. 7 14 *note*
Latin 1 11 *etc* 34 81 83 88 89 97 *seq* 101 *note* 102 *seq* 105 *seq* 168 180/181 *et saepe*
Latins *a* 178 192 *etc*
„ *c d e ff*$_2$ *l* 141 168
„ *d* 133 171 178 183 *etc*
Lausiac history 117 138 140 162 166 178
Lucifer 98 160 162 170 171 173 186 187 *et alibi*

Macarius 120/140 162 164 166 169 170 188 190
Mallon (*Gram. copte*) 33 53 147
Mark the monk 119 120 127 *note* 140/160 163 166 168 169 182 190
Mental process 25 28 30/31 32 46 49 55 58 86 89 134 159 186/187
Middle Egyptian 3 26 77 160
Moling 140
Morgan Gospels 140 172

Order 2 4 5 7 14 15 16 20 22 24 26 27 28 37 38 39 42 44 45 48 49 52 53 54 57 64 65 66 67 69 74 78 83 88 92 94 171 174
Origen vi 118 131 132 135 137 142 144 146 147 155 156 159 160 161 163 172 174 175 179 183/184 187 190 191 *etc*
Orsiesius 120 157 161 168/173 174 177
Oxyrynchus 123

Pachomius 120 *seq* 168 169
Palladius 117 120 130 134 135 162/166
Petr. Alex. 167
Peyron (*Dict. copte*) 154 162
Polycarp 146
Polyglot bases 2 15 19 20 22 33 61 82 97 110
Present participle 61 63
Primasius *saepe*
Punctuation 26 45/46 55

Retranslation 107 *etc*
Revised Version 137 171 188 *etc*

Serapion 120 160/162 169
Sylburg 84
Syr S 13 16 17 19 21 and *note* 26 27 33 41 42 46 48 54 55 59 64 67 70 71 74 79 82 85 89 91 97 99 129 168 179 *etc*

Tattam 17 (see also T$^{t}$, pp. 65 77 90 *etc*)
Tertullian 7 11 15 *etc* 80 83 93 119 131 143 147 150 151 156 163 164 170 171 176 183 187 188 190 *etc*
Tichonius *saepe*
Tischendorf vi 7 10 *etc* 67 91 120 125 129 137 144 147 150 151 153 154 159 160 161 164 167 169 175 178 184 188 *etc*

$W^{gr}$ (Freer) 111 120 163
Wells, Dean of v
Westcott and Hort 120 137 161 175 188 *etc*
Wiseman 98

εχω 26 84 85
νους 126

ϩнт 126 *etc*

## IN RE INDIVIDUAL COPTIC MSS.:

*Boh*

A 15 33 60 64 69 87 88 90 173 190
B 25 33 87 88 90 148
C 15 37 69 72 79 90
D 3 *note* 5 31 64 72 87 90
$D_2$ 173 179
E 3 *note* 87 90
F 3 *note* 87 88 90 154
$F_1$ 161
G 72 87 90
H 57 64 72 82 90 148
J 148
K 3 *note* 154 173 180
L 187
M 3 *note* 140 and *note* 150 161
N 5 15 33 60 87 90
O 121 185 187
T 15 65 72
Z 37 64 72 90

$\aleph^{cat}$ 163
Γ 3 *note*
Δ 3 *note*

*Sah*

73 3 *note*
111 3 *note*
134 3 *note*
$m^1$ 3 *note*
$113^a$ 3 *note*
114 142 175

# INDEX OF SCRIPTURAL QUOTATIONS.


Matthew
i. 20 144
v. 25 173
26 173
40 122 *note*
42 178/179
vi. 5 166
12 173 176
14 173 176 186
15 186
16 166 167
21 126 127
22 122
24 172
25 127 143 145
31 126
32 127
33 143 144
vii. 3 191/192
7 139 180
11 127
12 143
13 186 187
14 186 192
15 160 187
16 180 187
21 180
viii. 20 191
21 179
22 168
29 111 *note* 118
ix. 6 119
11 162
12 134 162
x. 20 189
38 140
42 128
xi. 12 136
18/19 162

Matthew
xi. 29 144 183
30 167 183
xii. 33 180
48 119
50 168
xiii. 3/8 190
24 167
25/30 190
31/32 174
33 140
44 142 145
47 190
47/48 175
xv. 1/12 190
11 125 127
xvi. 24 131
26 139
28 143
xviii. 3 185
19 184
32/35 140 141 186
xix. 21 181
27/29 179
xx. 27 128
xxi. 22 130
31 160
xxii. 11/13 190
11 179
13 179
14 190
35/40 187 188
xxiii. 4 170
9/10 162
xxiv. 20 140 145
28 175
43/44 192
51 169
xxv. 11 179

Matthew
xxv. 21 140 169 190 191
23 140 169 190 191
33 190
34 174
35 174
40 129 174
41 174
44 174
xxvi. 26 144
39 175
xxvii. 65 101 *note*

Mark
ii. 17 134 162
18 162
viii. 35 141
ix. 35 128
x. 21 122 181
xi. 12 120
xii. 44 167
xiv. 35 175
xvi. 18 126

Luke
i. 35 144 177
ii. 9 169
52 170
iii. 8/9 180
iv. 35 126
v. 30 162
31 134 162
vi. 25 172
27/30 178
29 122 *note*
31 143

Luke
vi. 36 122 *note* 125 127
46 142
vii. 22/23 174 175
ix. 59 179
60 168
62 163 179
x. 4/5 182
17 161
18/19 176
41 130 167
42 130 167
xi. 5/8 173 180 181
8 132
13 127
34 122
xii. 19 161
32/33 176
34 126 127
35 177
35/37 171
39 192
xiii. 1 141
2/5 141
xiv. 18 122 *note*
26 131 141 179
33 140
xv. 7 181
xvi. 10 144
13 172
24 49 111 *note* 118
xvii. 10 183
37 175
xviii. 7 128 132
22 181
xxi. 4 167
34 192
xxii. 28/30 176
42 175
xxiii. 42 174
43 119
xxiv. 41 185
45 126

John
i. 2 131
3 142
12/13 176
43 161
iii. 14 187
iv. 24 122 *note*
34 142
v. 14 163
44 128 142 166
vii. 38/39 142
viii. 44 131
59 118
x. 1 125 127
7 125
9 125
11/13 171
31 118
xi. 9/10 172
xii. 24 179
26 173 179
xiii. 35 174 186
xiv. 2 143 181
6 142
15/17 189 190
16 173
18 179
21/23 170
21 122 133
23 133 136 174
26 134
27 172 173 174
30 178
xv. 4 179 184
5 142 179
5/6 180
6 190
13 144
14/15 188
16 142
18 172
19 189
22 140
xvi. 5 134
12/13 134
xvii. 9 180
15/16 180
21 136
20/21 180

John
xvii. 23 188 191
24 180 188 191
xviii. 28 126
xix. 28/30 181
xx. 17 188
xxi. 6 170
15/16 171

Acts
ii. 38 150
iv. 12 158 159
vi. 2/5 146
xiv. 22 131 190 191
xvi. 16/19 119
xix. 2/6 145
xx. 28 170
32 170
xxi. 13 181

Romans
i. 21 163 164
25 153
26 163
28 126 163 164
ii. 4/5 122
28 182
29 173 182
iii. 5/6 155
23/24 149 155
iv. 15 125
v. 8/9 151
14 151
20 125
vi. 4 151 184
5 151
6 184
7 149 182
8 167
9 182
16 177
22 122 *note*
vii. 2/3 184
19/20 136
23 126
24/25 147
25 126
viii. 2 147 150 151

Romans
viii. 3 136
10 177 184
12 151
13 191
16 151
18 136 168
26 134
28 130 136
29 122 *note*
35 136 150 187
38 151 187
39 151 187
x. 17 148
xi. 25 182
34 126
34/36 148
xii. 1 152 160
2 126 151 154
5 189
6 139
10 149
17 191
xiv. 4 170
5 126
23 164
xv. 2 155

1 Corinthians
i. 10 126
17 146 147
18 132 133
21 132
23/24 122 123 127 131 132 133
27/29 146 147
30 133
ii. 2 159
6/7 135
9 125 134 155 176
10 134 189
11 134
13/15 135
16 126 189
iii. 1/3 185
3 190
17 135

1 Corinthians
iii. 18 154 164
iv. 5 152
8 133
9 134
20 122 *note*
v. 31 128
vi. 9 164
11 150
16 184
17 135 136 184
19 160
vii. 16 164
32/33 179
33/34 167
ix. 20 135
22 135
24 177
25 164 178
27 122
x. 9 187
11 156 157 171
13 130 136
17 144
21 191
31 128
32 155
xi. 1 180
2 170
3 183
7/12 183 184
10 173
22 170
27 192
29 192
xiii. 1 181
3/5 181
5/7 153
7 119 182
8 130 182
11 130
12 173 188
xiv. 14 126
15 126
19 126
20 185
xv. 3 151
26 122

1 Corinthians
xv. 41 181
49 122 *note* 188
50 131 173 179 190 191

2 Corinthians
i. 6 155 156
iii. 7/11 137
12 137
17 125
18 122 132 137 173 188
iv. 6 138 177
7 133 177
v. 1 122 182
10 175 192
15 152 155 190
16 157
20 153
vi. 14 132
16 131 184
vii. 1 135 177
viii. 9 152
14 168
15 168 169
x. 5 131 136 149
7 138
xi. 2 135
4 159
14 130 136
xii. 5 164
7 130 164
xiii. 3 136
5 148 177 *bis* 190
13 135

Galatians
i. 10 155
18 164
19/20 176
ii. 20 136
iii. 3 151
27 136 180
28 165 167
iv. 1/3 185
6 151
26 150

Galatians
v. 9 186
13 172
15 169
16 156
17 148 156
22/23 150 165 179
24 176
vi. 1 122 *note* 186
2 156
5 175
7 155
16 182

Ephesians
i. 23 159
ii. 3 151 153
8/9 151
14 182
16 182
iii. 5 158
6 189
14/17 146
16/18 177
19 133
iv. 13 150 151 185
14/15 185
16 185
17 126
22/24 181
23 126
30 134 150 151 169 170
31 122 127 136 180
v. 3/5 180
6/11 180
8 151
14 154
30 189
31, 32 189
vi. 6 155
11 124 171 172 173 174
12 122 151 171 172 173 174
14 167
16 167

Ephesians
vi. 17 167 177
18 154
23 135

Philippians
i. 9 146
23 165
ii. 3 149
7 190
5/8 146
5/10 145
7 133
12 122 *note*
iii. 8 161
10/11 175
12 150
20 134
iv. 5 154 176
6 154 170 176
7 126 176
8 152

Colossians
i. 24 155
ii. 2 146
9/10 159
11/12 181
17 122 *note*
18 126
21 156
iii. 1/3 175
10 167
13 170
15 177

1 Thessalonians
i. 9 129
v. 2 185
3 185
5 122 185
7 185
8 185

2 Thessalonians
ii. 2 126
iii. 7/9 190

2 Thessalonians
iii. 8 166
10 129

Hebrews
ii. 14/15 185
iii. 12 129
iii. 16–iv. 3 129
iv. 10 173 181
11 129
12 149
13 148
v. 7 131
11 158
14 138
vi. 1/2 147
4 122 *note* 124
4/6 147
13/14 185
vii. 2 157 158
3 157 158
4 157 158
13/14 157 158
ix. 14 129
x. 1 122 *note*
22 129 146
26 147
34 175
xi. 1 148
17 155
xii. 8 136
22 150
xiii. 16 173

1 Timothy
i. 5 124
7 148 158
9 166
15/16 161
ii. 4 142 150
8 122
iv. 8 176
v. 6 127
8 121
12 121
vi. 5 126
6/10 172
7 139

2 Timothy
ii. 4 167 179
5 179
6 179
12 167 176
22 185
iii. 5 152
8 126
iv. 2 121
6/8 170
9 161

Titus
i. 2 182
15 126

James
i. 17 150 151 154 155
26 177
ii. 12 150
19 180
20 180
26 180
iv. 4 178
6 140 154
v. 19/20 186

1 Peter
ii. 1/2 185
11 178 180 190
24 181
iii. 15 170/171
iv. 7 154
12 156
v. 5 140
7 154
8 151

2 Peter
i. 5/9 180
9 147 150 151 173
19 138
ii. 1 158
22 149

1 John
ii. 3 180
14 185
18 166
29 180
iii. 2 180
8/9 180
10 180
12/14 173
13/14 180
16 156
iv. 16 152
18 152
v. 19 178

2 John
ii. 15/17 178
iii. 7/8 178

Apocalypse
i. 3 14
4 13
5 13
6 99 111
7 14
9 105 111
11 14 103
16 5 14 105
ii. 1 5 14
2 9 14
5 5 14 105
9 6 15 105
13 6 15 105
15 15
16 15
17 6 15
22 7 11 15 119
23 9 15 16
25 16 99
iii. 1 16
3 3 16
4 16
5 16
8 16
9 16
10 16
14 16
16 6 16

Apocalypse
iii. 17 16
18 16
19 16 17 107
iv. 6 17
7 17
8 17 103
9 17
10 17
11 9 17
v. 1 7 18
2 18 119
4 18
5 6 18
7/9 18
9 119
10 8 18
12 19 106
13 3 4 19
14 19
vi. 1 19
2 3 4 19
4 6 7 9 19 20
5/8 20
9 6 19 20 106
10/12 21
13 6 9 21 22
14 21 *note* 22
14/16 22
17 22 23
vii. 1/2 23
3 9 23
4 23
5/8 23
9 10 23
11/13 23
14 23 24
15 24
16 4 24
viii. 1 24
3/5 24
7 24 103
8 24
9 4 6 24 25
10 25
11 3 4 25
12/13 25
ix. 1 25

Apocalypse
ix. 2 6 25 26
3 107
5/11 26
7 106
8 107
12 8 26
13 6 7 10 26
14/16 27
17 6 27 101
18/19 27
20 2 27
21 27 28 107
x. 1 6 28
2 10 28
3 28 106
4 6 28 104 106
5 28 29
6/9 29
10 3 29
11 8 29
xi. 1 29 30
2/7 30
8 8 30 31
9 4 31
10 31 107
11 8 31
12 8 31
13/14 31
15 6 31 32
16 8 32
17 6 32
18 10 32 33
19 10 33
xii. 1/2 33 107
3 106
3/5 34
6 8 34
7 34
8 4 10 35 36
9 2 36
10 36 103
11 36 37
12 3 37 38
13/15 38
16 10 38
17 4 38 39
xiii. 1 39 40

Apocalypse
xiii. 2/4 40
5 40 41 107 111
6 41
7 2 41
8/9 41
10 10 41 107
12 3 4 41
13 41
14 6 41
15/16 42
17 4 9 42
18 42 43 126
xiv. 1 10 43
2/5 43
3 106
6/7 44
8 7 44
9 10 44 45
10 10 45
11/12 45
13 3 45 46 107
14 46 47
15/18 47
18 106
19 4 47 48
20 48
xv. 1 48 100
2 48
3 4 48 49 50 97 106
4 10 50
5/6 51
7 51 52
8 52
xvi. 1 52
2 8 10 52 53
3 6 53 100
4 10 53 54
5 54
6 6 54 55 106
7 55
8 6 55 102
9 55 56 102 104
10 56
11 56 57
12/13 57
14 8 57 105 106

Apocalypse
xvi. 16 6 58
17 10 58
18 10 58
19 4 58 106
20/21 58
xvii. 2 6 58
3 106
4 58
6 58 59
8 10 59 106
9 4 59 105 126
10 4 60
11/14 60
15 10 60 61
16 61 106
17 10 61
18 61
xviii. 1 61 62
2/5 62
4 104
6 4 63
7/8 63
9 63 64
10/11 62 64 105
12 5 10 64 65 104 106
13 65 107
14 6 65
14/15 65 66 105
16 2 10 66
17 66 104
18 9 66
19 5 66 67
20 67
21 5 67
22 5 9 10 67 68 112 113
23 68 99 106 113/115
24 68 115 116
xix. 1 68
2 68 69 107 108
3 69 109
4 6 69
5 3 6 7 69 70 99
6 70 108

Apocalypse
xix. 7 8 70 108
8 70 108 109
9 2 6 9 70 71 100 110
10 71 107 108 109
11 71 72 107
12 108
12/14 72
13 107 108
14 108
15 72 99 110
16 6 72 73 108
17 3 5 73 108
18 73 106 110
19 73 74 108
20 10 74 97 106 108
21 74 75
xx. 1 6 75 106
2 2 6 10 75
3 75 76
4/5 76 106
6 6 76 77

Apocalypse
xx. 7 77
8 3 5 77 107
9 77 78
10 78
11 78 79
12 3 79
13 79
14 79 80
15 80
xxi. 1 80
2 80 81
3 81 106
4 5 81 82 97 99
5 11 82 83
6 7 83 106
7/8 83
9 6 83 84
10/11 84 106
12 84 85 106
13/15 85
16 85 86 107
17/18 86
19 83 86 87 101 102

Apocalypse
xxi. 20 5 87
21 5 87
22/23 87 107
24 87 88
25/26 88 106
27 88 89
xxii. 1 89
2 89 90
3 90
5 9 90 91 106
6 5 91
7 91
8 7 92
9/10 92 107
11 92 93
12/13 93
14 3 93 94
15 94
16 94 95 106 107
17/18 95
19 11 95 96 109
20 7 8 96
21 11 96

LONDON:
PRINTED BY WILLIAM CLOWES AND SONS, LIMITED,
DUKE STREET, STAMFORD STREET, S.E., AND GREAT WINDMILL STREET, W.

BOOK TO BE RETURNED

225.49
B676
H826

Hoskier, Herman Charles
AUTHOR

Concerning the date of the Bohairic
TITLE version.

225.49
B676
H826

Hoskier, Herman Charles
Concerning the date of the
Bohairic version.

31023